





RB11224




Library  
of the  
University of Toronto

HANDBOUND  
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF  
TORONTO PRESS





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto









9047

# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

### HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No.:

4

DATE:

APRIL 28, 1964.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865

364-7383









1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Tuesday, April 28th,  
1964, commencing at 10.00 a.m.,  
et seq.

COMMISSION:

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.	Commissioner
F. H. Finnis	Secretary
L. Feldman	Research Officer
T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

THE VILLAGE OF SWANSEA	353 - 376
THE CITY OF TORONTO	377 - 504

\* \* \* \* \*







1 THE COMMISSIONER: The Village of Swansea.

2  
3  
4 SUBMISSION OF

5 THE VILLAGE OF SWANSEA

6 Appearances:

7 L. C. Kurata Reeve  
8 H. B. Squarebriggs Deputy Reeve  
9 Mrs. Helen J. Begg Councillor  
10 Mr. J. M. Smith (Woods, Gordon)

11  
12  
13 MR. KURATA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.  
14 I would like to introduce the members of our delegation  
15 from the Village of Swansea. There is Deputy Reeve  
16 Squarebriggs, Councillor Mrs. Helen J. Begg, Mr. J. M.  
17 Smith of Woods, Gordon, who prepared our brief, and  
18 myself.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You know that I have  
20 read the brief?

21 MR. KURATA: Yes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: And it is not necessary  
23 for you to read it.

24 MR. KURATA: No, I appreciate that.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Feel free to do whatever  
26 you like, but I am telling you I have read and analysed  
27 it, and I have my notes on it. You proceed in your  
28 own way.

29 MR. KURATA: I would indicate the theme  
30 of our brief is the Metropolitan form of government has







1 served the area well during the first ten years. How-  
2 ever, we would be among the first to recognize that it  
3 has produced certain problems, but that we feel these  
4 problems could be readjusted without abandoning the  
5 existing form of Metropolitan government, which form  
6 of government by the way, is just now becoming generally  
7 accepted by the area residents.

8 I will reiterate on page 5, paragraph 1, we  
9 deal with the village problems under roads, and I would  
10 bring to your attention under this service that the  
11 village is composed of hills and valleys; three major  
12 arteries taking 30,000 cars a day, and we feel that  
13 this is a service that has been maintained at a very  
14 high level under local government, and we have reser-  
15 vations about what would take place should we lose  
16 this as a local service.

17 Another point I would like to bring to the  
18 Commission's attention is the Smallwood thesis, "Metro-  
19 politan Toronto a Decade Later." Under this thesis  
20 there are certain problems that have been brought to  
21 the attention of the public at large. Under these  
22 services, I feel many of these problems could be answer-  
23 ed by an equation rather than a complete change of  
24 existing form of government; the water system, should  
25 there be any inequality, there is a case where an  
26 equation could be set up to readjust any inequalities.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Which system?

28 MR. KURATA: The water system, should there  
29 be any problems.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: What inequality would





1 there be?

2 MR. KURATA: I am not aware of any at this  
3 present moment except that I foresee a future problem  
4 with the capital works programme at the Metropolitan  
5 level of government which we approved of this year,  
6 where it may require an increase of cost through the city,  
7 and this would create or could create an imbalance.

8 Fire protection is very important because  
9 ours is a volunteer fire department, and under any change,  
10 if it were to be unified, it would produce at least a  
11 500 per cent increase in cost, and I feel that this is  
12 a service that can continue ten to fifteen years depend-  
13 ing on how much density is produced in our area. It has  
14 served very well. The only addition I would add there  
15 is that our equipment is all radio-equipped, and is  
16 handled from a central dispatch area in the municipal  
17 hall.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you consider that a  
19 volunteer firefighting service is adequate in this  
20 day and age, bearing in mind the proximity of Swansea  
21 to the City of Toronto on the one side, and Etobicoke  
22 on the other?

23 MR. KURATA: We have a peculiar problem --  
24 or not a peculiar problem; it is a peculiar characteris-  
25 tic of our fire department and that is the fact we have  
26 the Steel Company which is located on the Queensway and  
27 more than fifty per cent of the volunteers work with  
28 the Steel Company so they are in the village on a  
29 24-hour basis. That is one thing I should bring to  
30 your attention.







1                   The other is that the volunteer fire  
2 department has worked very well. We have had no major  
3 problems. We had a large fire within the last month  
4 which I think they distinguished themselves in fighting.  
5 There was no problem. As a matter of fact we had a  
6 number of young cadets who went out to this fire.

7                   I was going to indicate a further charac-  
8 teristic or addition to this, we have a working arrange-  
9 ment with York Township whereby they cooperate with us  
10 and we cooperate with them. I indicated to you, Mr.  
11 Chairman, I feel this is a service which may require  
12 change if the density is increased, but at the present  
13 rate of expansion in the village, and granting the  
14 fact that we have volunteers, it is a service that I  
15 feel could be extended very efficiently over the next  
16 ten or fifteen years, or even longer, depending on the  
17 demands created by added density.

18                  Another thing I would like to bring out  
19 that has not been pointed out, we have set up in the  
20 last year a very significant system whereby there are  
21 fire inspections made in apartments and private dwell-  
22 ings to reduce fire hazards, and this system has proved  
23 very useful. It has brought to our attention a  
24 number of situations where there are hazardous conditions  
25 existing in apartment buildings and private homes and  
26 in commercial undertakings.

27                  Now, under health we have a very close  
28 liaison because of our size. Here again it could be  
29 discussed as one of the problems under the existing system,  
30 but here again I feel it is a case where there could be a







1 formulization or equation set up should there be any  
2 inequalities such as existed with the welfare service.

3 Under recreation I feel the village pro-  
4 duces the answer to very important recreational needs,  
5 and I would bring to the Commission's attention that  
6 we have very little juvenile delinquency in our area;  
7 yet within half a mile to the north and half a mile  
8 on the east where much greater sums are spent in  
9 recreation, they have extreme problems with juvenile  
10 delinquency.

11 On page 11 I think it is summarized very  
12 well that the functions which I have tried to describe  
13 briefly, in conjunction with the functions administered  
14 through Metropolitan Toronto, give to the residents  
15 of the Village of Swansea a very high level of services  
16 comparable to those provided to residents in any of the  
17 other area municipalities. Secondly it is our be-  
18 lief that this level of services is satisfactory to  
19 the village residents.

20 On page 12 there is a table setting forth  
21 our various rankings which should be perhaps gone over  
22 again. It would appear that our relative costs are  
23 high with respect to recreation and community ser-  
24 vices, partly reflecting, we feel, a very full range  
25 of village services in this field. However, it is  
26 our common practice that the costs of maintaining  
27 parks, trees and weed control are all costed in this  
28 category.

29 Now, our general government standing is  
30 also relatively high, but under our accounting







1 procedures salaries and wage costs of employees whose  
2 time may be divided, say, between hydro and water  
3 are all costed to the general government account. In  
4 other words, what we lose on the swings we make on the  
5 punches.

6 On page 18 we go on record and say we  
7 feel that the local administration of certain types  
8 of service is the most suitable in that they either  
9 depend on intimate local knowledge or should reflect  
10 particular local needs, conditions or wishes. In  
11 stating our belief we would wish to add that the  
12 determination of a local function on this basis is  
13 of course also subject to there being no conflict  
14 with the interests of neighbouring municipalities in  
15 the area generally. We have never had any real con-  
16 flict with any of our neighbours in this regard.

17 On page 18 we briefly discuss many of the  
18 problems or inequalities that have been referred to,  
19 and probably the assumption again is Doctor  
20 Smallwood's thesis. The first one he points out  
21 is public housing. I feel that this is a case  
22 where cost of a national or provincial service has  
23 been thrust to Metropolitan taxpayers and it is  
24 not a fair assessment of the problem to say that Metro  
25 has broken down in this field. It is a matter of  
26 critical cost consideration to the Metropolitan tax-  
27 payer, so we feel this is a real criticism of the  
28 existing form of Metropolitan government.

29 Again in planning I think it is best sum-  
30 marized on page 19 that in this field the interests of







1 Metropolitan Toronto and those of the local municipali-  
2 ties have not been sufficiently well delineated, and  
3 of course this is quite apparent where problems could  
4 exist where the areawide planning board had a con-  
5 flict with a local planning board in a local planning  
6 problem.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: How would you divide  
8 their responsibilities? That is, as between the  
9 Metropolitan Planning Board and the local planning  
10 board?

11 MR. KURATA: I think we would have to  
12 return to the basis of an areawide plan and local plan.  
13 For instance, local parks, local subdivisions, where  
14 they were not going to produce a burden on a metro-  
15 politan function; I think this should be a case where  
16 the local planning board should have or the local  
17 council, depending on whether there is a planning board  
18 or not, should have the final decision. Where it is  
19 going to interfere with, say, a metropolitan artery  
20 or subway extension, this obviously is a case where  
21 the Metropolitan Planning Board should override the  
22 local planning board.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You say in your brief  
24 in this field of planning the interests of Metropolitan  
25 Toronto and those of the local municipalities have  
26 not been sufficiently well delineated. Do you think  
27 they could be clearly delineated in such a way as to  
28 avoid conflict?

29 MR. KURATA: I feel that they could. I  
30 feel there is a certain amount of -- for lack of a better





1 word, politics is a bit involved with some of these  
2 problems, and I think the Metropolitan Toronto  
3 Planning Board has been reluctant to run headlong  
4 into a local planning problem and they use the usual  
5 devices available to them of referral or restudy.  
6 In other words, they don't wish to go head on into  
7 a conflict.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you like them to?

9 MR. KURATA: I think it would be the  
10 function of the Metropolitan Planning Board if there  
11 was a real conflict over a Metropolitan planning need  
12 and a local municipality were going to, say, step in  
13 and perhaps interfere or completely destroy some  
14 Metropolitan planning project, and the converse also.  
15 I do not think that the area planning board should  
16 have the right to completely override a local planning  
17 board where the local planning board is considering  
18 a park extension or a subdivision or development  
19 which would not interfere with any Metropolitan function.

20 Now, to summarize this I would like to  
21 bring to your attention a workshop paper. This is  
22 speaking to the general criticism that costs of  
23 services because of red tape, duplicity and so on  
24 have been excessive under the existing form of Metro-  
25 politan government.

26 -

27 -







1 I think it is interesting to bring to the  
2 Chairman's attention the workshop paper in 1962,  
3 Section 4, wherein Mr. Eric Hardy, who prepared the  
4 City of Toronto brief in 1962, speaks about the cost  
5 of services, and I quote from the last paragraph  
6 on page 57.

7 "Lacking certainty about any of them,  
8 however, it was decided to assume continued  
9 control by the area municipalities in cal-  
10 culating 1966 spending for each. Consequently  
11 the predicted level of spending must be regarded  
12 as conservative because some of the transfer  
13 of functions may be anticipated and we can  
14 count on such a transfer producing an early  
15 and sizeable increase in the level of spend-  
16 ing on the affected service."

17 This is speaking of services in general.  
18 At page 66, the first paragraph, of the same paper,  
19 speaking about welfare services, he says:

20 "Nevertheless it is suggested that the  
21 total forecast of expenditure in 1966 in this  
22 category would rise substantially if Metro  
23 were to take over the responsibility for it.  
24 Such an increase would result largely from  
25 the establishment of uniform standards  
26 throughout Metropolitan Toronto, both with  
27 regard to the screening and acceptance of  
28 cases for assistance and to the amount of  
29 assistance subsequently provided."

30 So here is one person's point of view in







1 1962.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: What document is that?

3 MR. KURATA: It is a workshop paper of the  
4 Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Mr.  
5 Chairman.

6 There has been this criticism of parochialism.  
7 I feel it has taken ten years to remove a great deal  
8 of the parochial concept of all area municipalities  
9 involved, but I feel it should be a matter of education  
10 rather than dictatorship.

11 In other words, this existing form of  
12 Metropolitan government was a form of government that  
13 we all had to learn to live with. There were sub-  
14 stantial changes in 1953, and I think any thinking  
15 person will realize that even if the existing form  
16 of Metropolitan government remains there will be a  
17 change over the next ten years. It will be a matter  
18 of educating ratepayers and taxpayers rather than  
19 any form of dictatorship.

20 At the end of this I might indicate again  
21 that the City of Toronto itself has been the result  
22 of some forty-two amalgamations and annexations in  
23 its desire to solve some of its financial ills, and  
24 really none of them have succeeded. There is no  
25 reason to believe the forty-third would succeed  
26 either. I felt this is an important thing to bring  
27 to your attention. During the thirties the Village  
28 of Swansea was negotiating with the City of Toronto  
29 with a view to becoming part of the City of Toronto.  
30 At that time the City of Toronto did not wish to





1 consider these negotiations.

2 I will not touch on education. I under-  
3 stood there would be a representative of the School  
4 Board here this morning, but apparently there is  
5 nobody here. I should add ---

6 THE COMMISSIONER: On education I believe  
7 the brief will be what you have in your brief here,  
8 because I have received no individual brief from the  
9 Board of Education.

10 MR. KURATA: The only other thing I would  
11 add is under "Library Services" at Appendix A. A  
12 high degree of cooperation has existed for many years  
13 with the Toronto Public Library and it has been to  
14 mutual satisfaction. There has never been any con-  
15 flict that I know of and it has been, as I say, a  
16 very high degree of cooperation.

17 Thank you very much.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Kurata, at the  
19 bottom of page 22 of your brief you say: "In regard  
20 to local services, we believe the suggestion that  
21 there should be uniformity of the level of services --  
22 or a greater degree of uniformity through the pooling  
23 of resources is itself invalid."

24 If not uniformity, should there not be  
25 a minimum standard for some services throughout the  
26 area?

27 You can call on anyone to answer if you  
28 want them.

29 MR. SMITH: I was just going to add that  
30 we did discuss this point in several meetings with







1 Council and certainly I think that their general view  
2 was that in some areas -- you could practically even  
3 say in all areas -- but in some particularly certainly  
4 there would have to be a minimum essential level of  
5 services and in this sense perhaps one could agree  
6 that there is this idea of uniformity which applies --  
7 uniformity in some minimal sense.

8 This would be certainly true, I should  
9 think, of the education area for example. There is  
10 no question but what there should be some minimum  
11 level, not to be construed as a barely adequate kind  
12 of level, but a defined acceptable standard uniform  
13 level which sets the floor, if you like. Then  
14 local variations could be built on top of this level.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: You mention education.  
16 Would you mention any of the other services?

17 MR. SMITH: Perhaps we can say that gener-  
18 ally as regards what we have attempted to call "area  
19 functions" or "area services", one would expect  
20 uniformity, but in respect of purely local services  
21 it would not be apparent to us that a case could be  
22 made for uniformity with respect to these so-called  
23 local services which have no inter-area ramifications.  
24 They are concerned only with the service within a  
25 given municipal unit. There is no case that we can  
26 see for uniformity with respect to these services.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Again you are using  
28 the term "uniformity". I was talking of a minimum  
29 standard. I was not suggesting uniformity.

30 MR. SMITH: I am sorry. My difficulty is







1 that I did not pick up your quote in the first place.  
2 I am working from a draft.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: It is the last para-  
4 graph on page 22, the last line. You say that uni-  
5 formity of the level of services is not necessary --  
6 and I am not arguing with you on that point. My  
7 point was, might it not be desirable to have certain  
8 minimum standards? Now you said that that would  
9 apply to education. I was wondering if you would  
10 agree that that might also apply to some of the strictly  
11 local services which you list on page 16, such as  
12 public health and welfare?

13 MR. KURATA: On the welfare, I think that  
14 statement I have from this workshop paper is cognizant.  
15 Your point that if welfare were to be taken over on  
16 a Metropolitan basis in the Village of Swansea where  
17 our need is not as great as the larger municipalities,  
18 I think you would find that the level of service that  
19 we have in the Village is perhaps higher than the  
20 minimum, but by producing uniformity it would definite-  
21 ly tend to increase the cost of the overall service.

22 Does that answer your question?

23 THE COMMISSIONER: No, it does not, because  
24 I have not that in mind. I did not suggest the possi-  
25 bility of transferring welfare to Metro. I just  
26 wanted your opinion as to whether in the case of  
27 welfare the Metropolitan Corporation might not estab-  
28 lish certain minimum standards and it would be up  
29 to the municipalities ---

30 MR. KURATA: To live up to them.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: To vary those standards  
2 upwards if they want to.

3 MR. KURATA: I would feel that on page 23,  
4 even though it is not in words, I think it is implied  
5 -- or I would certainly speaking as an individual  
6 agree wholeheartedly with this point of view, that  
7 there should be a definite minimum.

8 Do you want to answer that, Mr. Smith?

9 MR. SMITH: No, I think not. There might  
10 be room for an assumption with respect to most local  
11 services surely that they would tend towards -- I do  
12 not want to use the word "uniform" because it is not  
13 your point; but the two are connected in a way, I  
14 should think -- a uniform standard and a minimum  
15 essential.

16 Would there not tend to be a tendency  
17 towards establishing a kind of uniform minimum just through  
18 the normal political pressures that the Council  
19 would feel to raise some given service to the  
20 sort of going level of the area? Should it for  
21 example exist year in and year out to render a par-  
22 ticular service at an unsatisfactory level in relation  
23 to the comparable services being rendered around it?  
24 I do not know how effectively competition works here,  
25 but I suspect they feel the pressure to render the  
26 same kind of service as is being rendered around them.

27 I am not sure we have got your point yet.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: I see what you are  
29 saying. I think you have explained what I asked.

30 You said nothing, Mr. Kurata, about your







1 recommendation on representation, which you deal with  
2 at page 23 on. I notice that on page 26 you say  
3 that under the system which you recommend the City of  
4 Toronto would have six representatives on Council  
5 out of twenty-two.

6 You also recommend a system of block voting  
7 -- multiple voting. Do you think with forty per cent  
8 of the population you could reasonably ask Toronto  
9 to accept 27 per cent of the representation on Council?  
10 I worked out those percentages myself.

11 MR. SMITH: Let me just say this in a  
12 preliminary way. Perhaps I could ask a question to  
13 bring it out most easily.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: You will ask the  
15 question and answer it.

16 MR. SMITH: About ---

17 THE COMMISSIONER: My job is to ask ques-  
18 tions.

19 MR. SMITH: Then I will answer the next  
20 question. The point simply is that we would have  
21 thought the percentage of Council votes would have been  
22 the percentage you might have measured and just on the  
23 face of it this would be rather closer to 40 per cent  
24 than the representation. The representation per-  
25 centage will vary really according to how the popula-  
26 tion units are rounded. It tends to throw the repre-  
27 sentation percentages up or down from year to year.

28 But I believe just looking at it; I do  
29 not recall we calculated the percentage, but having  
30 some 30 votes out of 82 would give you what? -- 36







1 per cent or thereabouts of the voting power, which I  
2 would think would be the appropriate criterion of the  
3 relationship between votes. Your representation by  
4 population is surely measured by voting power.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you say that  
6 one councillor with ten votes is as effective as  
7 ten councillors each with one vote?

8 MR. SMITH: No, I think not. We were  
9 conscious of this point and in designing the formula  
10 the way we did we tried to reach some sort of reasonable  
11 compromise between the number of votes that a councillor  
12 would be able to exercise and also tried to retain  
13 limitations with regard to the size of the Council  
14 itself.

15 We did not like the idea of a single  
16 councillor exercising ten votes versus one who would  
17 only exercise one. This seemed to give us a kind of  
18 halfway house. I think we would agree that it would  
19 be preferable to have 5 councillors exercising one  
20 vote than to have one exercising five.

21 Yet the perfect formula does not exist,  
22 we think, and so we just gave a reasonable compromise,  
23 we thought.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I see your problem.  
25 I hope you see mine too.

26 MR. SMITH: Yes, I think so.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: You make it quite  
28 clear that you are opposed to amalgamation. On page  
29 30 in the first paragraph you say that the defect of  
30 the amalgamation proposal -- well, it is big, "its





1 remoteness of government from the people."

2 I assume that is your argument against an  
3 amalgamated City of Toronto. Would you say that North  
4 York or Scarborough, which are pretty big, are already  
5 too big, that they are remote from the people? I  
6 am leaving out the City of Toronto.

7 MR. SMITH: Quite so.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: We are now talking  
9 about two of the suburbs which have been suggested as  
10 possible units under a system of consolidation, or a  
11 borough system.

12 MR. SMITH: Well, there is some hesitation  
13 about proposing that these units should be broken up  
14 so that they could enjoy the advantages of a village  
15 such as Swansea, but none of us could decide where  
16 the test of becoming too big applied. I do not  
17 think the Council ever expressed a view that any one  
18 of these units is already too big. They exist now  
19 and there it is. But it would be worsened in their  
20 view by consolidating the whole mass.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: On the same point you  
22 talk of the motivations that go to recommend the borough  
23 system and you list one of them -- "to achieve greater  
24 efficiency of administration."

25 You go on to say: "But once the distinction  
26 between area and local functions has been recognized,  
27 we see no basis for this claim."

28 Would you say that efficiency in municipal  
29 administration is the same regardless of the size of  
30 the unit?







1 MR. SMITH: I am not sure that a relation-  
2 ship between the size and efficiency can be brought  
3 out, particularly when the distinction is made between  
4 these two types of functions that we spoke about.

5 It seemed to us that certain types of  
6 functions could be most efficiently handled at the  
7 local level. Perhaps "efficiency" is too narrow a  
8 word really to convey what was meant.

9 We cited the example of local distribution  
10 of power and water and so on, where we suggested that  
11 it is not a measure of efficiency but it is a desirable  
12 characteristic to have this administered locally, where  
13 the service needs of the customers can be met most  
14 easily -- a sort of face-to-face dealing with your  
15 local Commission; this idea. This gets away from  
16 the notion of efficiency but tends to suggest that  
17 certain functions are most effectively handled at  
18 the local level.

19  
20 -

21  
22  
23 -

24  
25  
26 -

27  
28  
29 -  
30







1 In Swansea and I assume in all others with  
2 respect to such things as road maintenance or road con-  
3 struction when we talked about this our understanding  
4 was that they could purchase these services or com-  
5 modities, as the case may be, as efficiently as their  
6 larger neighbours with the contractors they deal with.  
7 There seems to be no measurable advantage in size  
8 with respect to the dealings with contractors in these  
9 areas. We cannot associate any higher costs, for  
10 example, with the fact of a small scale loan.

11 We felt that other considerations, the  
12 sensitivity of direct dealing with commissions on  
13 local rendering of services, say, should be preserved  
14 where there were no obvious disadvantages in terms of  
15 cost. This contrast was something of a different  
16 nature to the borrowing area where it could be demon-  
17 strated borrowing costs could be reduced on an area  
18 basis and since borrowing costs form a major part of  
19 the function this could be done on an area basis in  
20 a straightforward way. I think we have to pre-  
21 serve the distinction between local and area. I  
22 don't think a case can be made for efficiency associa-  
23 ted with size.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Swansea purchases  
25 certain services from other municipalities, does it not,  
26 high school and library services?

27 MR. KURATA: Yes. We maintain our own  
28 library but there is a working agreement between the  
29 village and the City of Toronto on an individual  
30 basis. I perhaps did not make it clear. It is a





1 matter of cooperation. There is no charge on it.  
2 It is more of an advisory service that the TPL gives  
3 us.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it not rather an  
5 indication that Swansea has too small and limited re-  
6 sources to provide the services required of the  
7 modern municipality?

8 MR. KURATA: If you are speaking of the  
9 library situation the City of Toronto has maintained  
10 a large library near Runnymede and Bloor for a number  
11 of years. It was felt, I would think in the early  
12 stages, that a large library comparable in service to  
13 that in Runnymede would not be efficient. It would  
14 be a duplication. I feel that the TPL has been quite  
15 happy with our service. If we had done this their  
16 service would not have been as much use to the area.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I can well see that.

18 MR. KURATA: It was a matter of who did  
19 it first. Really it was a timing situation. In  
20 that particular service I cannot see there is any  
21 question of efficiency involved.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I was not thinking  
23 in terms of efficiency. I was thinking in terms of  
24 resources required of the municipality.

25 MR. KURATA: The Children's Library is  
26 a well stocked children's library. Until this year  
27 we haven't considered the adult field.

28 MR. SMITH: Your point, Mr. Commissioner,  
29 is you are generalizing now. We have tried to bring  
30 out, perhaps not in sufficient length, that we could







1 not see any evidence in some sort of economic sense  
2 that the village was too small to do an effective  
3 job. No examination of comparative cost data would  
4 suggest this. We know why. It is because generally  
5 cost comparisons are invalid anyway. They don't  
6 bring out anything.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: They frequently don't  
8 mean the same thing. The reason I am raising the  
9 issues is they have been raised before me. That is  
10 why I am presenting them.

11 MR. SMITH: The sort of rough tests in  
12 terms of the average level of the package of services  
13 being rendered, the debt level, and so on, the general  
14 inference was this kind of evidence is that indeed the  
15 unit could be administered economically. It is only  
16 a rough sort of calculation that comes out because of  
17 the nature of the standard you are looking to. None  
18 of these suggest it is uneconomical to do the job and  
19 do it evidently to the general satisfaction of the  
20 residents in the municipality.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have a Hydro  
22 Commission?

23 MR. KURATA: Yes, we have our own hydro.  
24 It is operated through a committee of council, Mr.  
25 Chairman, but it is a separate accounting procedure.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you have any  
27 objection to distribution of hydro power being placed  
28 on a Metropolitan basis? Do you see any particular  
29 value in continuing the present system of a separate  
30 commission or utility in each municipality? If you





1 have not considered it you don't have to answer.  
2 You have a management consultant with you and I thought  
3 I would benefit from his presence here.

4 MR. SMITH: We did not consider it in  
5 the way it deserves to be considered. In terms of  
6 our general thesis I think our argument would be that  
7 with respect to the local distribution of hydro electric  
8 power it is not obvious that unification of the distri-  
9 bution within Metro would have advantages. There  
10 is no question but what the wholesale distribution  
11 is clearly an area matter, but with respect to the  
12 retail distribution we would tend to go back to the  
13 advantages which appear to exist with respect to having  
14 a local commission looking after local service needs  
15 and being acutely sensitive to local demands. It  
16 is quite evident this is so in Swansea, perhaps be-  
17 cause it is so very small, but it is almost an ad-  
18 vantage in the sensitivity of its local people to  
19 local requirements. I don't think there are any  
20 obvious advantages in the efficiency sense in making  
21 retail distribution an area responsibility.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: You quoted Mr. Eric  
23 Hardy. Could I have a copy of that workshop paper?

24 MR. KURATA: Yes.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I know Mr. Hardy and  
26 I would like to see what he has written.

27 MR. KURATA: I have an office copy which  
28 I would be pleased to leave with you.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: I will accept it as a  
30 valid copy. Thank you very much, gentlemen. We







1 will adjourn for ten minutes before hearing the  
2 Toronto brief.

3  
4 ---Short recess.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Swansea has asked for  
6 five more minutes and I consented. Would you go  
7 ahead, Reeve Kurata?

8 MR. KURATA: You asked a question, Mr.  
9 Chairman, regarding the minimum service. I felt  
10 that I should bring to your attention, first of all,  
11 the matter of police. For some years prior to the  
12 unification of the Police Department Swansea maintained  
13 its own police force of some 24 members at a cost of  
14 one-third of our share of the Police under the  
15 Metropolitan form of government.

16 I think everyone in the village would  
17 state that the service when it was maintained at a  
18 local level was of a much higher degree. It would  
19 only take a matter of minutes to have the police come  
20 and answer a complaint or a problem. At the present  
21 time I think every citizen of Swansea is aware of the  
22 extreme problem that the Metro police have. However,  
23 it does take much longer for the police to arrive.  
24 Of course, our cost is three times what it was under  
25 the former existing service maintained at the local  
26 level.

27 Now under Fire as a minimal service I  
28 should bring to your attention the cost per person  
29 is \$2.30, which is the lowest fire cost in the Metro-  
30 politan Toronto. Even though we have a volunteer





1 fire department the underwriters have seen fit to grant  
2 the standard fire risks of policy holders in the  
3 Village of Swansea. They are not penalized to any  
4 degree. We have one of the lowest fire losses per  
5 capita in the Metropolitan area.

6 Under Roads snow removal is most important.  
7 The village is made up of a number of hills and valleys.  
8 In the last two storms it may have been brought to  
9 your attention that Swansea was one of the first  
10 municipalities to have snow removal on the main arter-  
11 ies and by the following noon all the streets in the  
12 village were cleaned.

13 Another matter is road service. We  
14 have very few potholes. I think we could go out  
15 today and not find one pothole in the village streets.  
16 The same is true of sidewalks.

17 We feel the services can be maintained  
18 at a much lower cost with a higher degree of service  
19 efficiency at the level which we now maintain.

20 Also in the field of planning, we are in  
21 process of clearing older areas before going to the  
22 newer areas for development purposes. In the larger  
23 areas, such as the City of Toronto, they have a dis-  
24 tinct problem to push their development areas through  
25 because they are so large.

26 I thank you for the added time.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

28

29

30







SUBMISSION BY

THE CITY OF TORONTO

Appearances:

Philip Givens

Mayor

Eric Hardy

Consultant

Wm. Campbell

Finance Commissioner

Wm. Callow

City Solicitor

MR. GIVENS: Mr. Commissioner, first of all I would like to introduce to you the members of our delegation here. We have our consultant, Mr. Eric Hardy; Commissioner William Campbell, our Finance Commissioner; the City Solicitor, Mr. William Callow; both of whom are members of a working committee. They have been working from last summer and are very cognizant and knowledgeable on all the salient factors and facts in the presentation that will be made to you.

My remarks will be in the nature of general remarks delineating the basis of the brief but I shall not go into the statistical details of the brief but outline the problem in a general way.

Mr. Commissioner, we come to this forum in the spirit of debate and negotiation which characterizes our system of government. We are, however, charged with the responsibility of placing the views of the citizens of Toronto before you with all the force and the vigour we can muster. Our presence is intended to help enhance and illuminate what we believe to be the salient truth that amalgamation is the inevitable, irresistible destiny of the communities





1 of Metropolitan Toronto.

2 We are certain, Mr. Commissioner, that  
3 you require no review of the historical development  
4 of this unique experiment known as Metropolitan govern-  
5 ment. We do believe it would be wise to recall one  
6 particular element in that story.

7  
8  
9  
10 -

11  
12  
13 -

14  
15  
16 -

17  
18  
19  
20 -

21  
22  
23 -

24  
25  
26  
27 -

28  
29  
30







1 Metropolitan Toronto was a compromise  
2 born of the city's application to the Ontario Municipal  
3 Board for total amalgamation of the city and suburbs.

4 Suburban municipalities vigorously  
5 opposed that application, but the provincial government,  
6 impressed equally by the strength of the opposition and  
7 the obvious need for drastic measures, conceived  
8 Metropolitan Toronto as a solution to the immediate  
9 short-term problems. The city accepted that decision  
10 as an interim technique for meeting the present urgent  
11 needs of the day, but we continue to regard Metropolitan  
12 Toronto as an experiment, a way station on the way to  
13 total amalgamation.

14 While we have unstintingly supported the  
15 work of successive Metropolitan Toronto Councils, we  
16 believe that effort must now be set in a broader  
17 framework.

18 Your appointment, Mr. Commissioner, may  
19 be taken as eloquent evidence that all is not well  
20 in the Metropolitan household. It is the most recent  
21 in a series of attempts to examine, diagnose and  
22 prescribe for the ills of this body politic. We  
23 confidently expect its findings will be more practical  
24 and effective, its recommendations more comprehensive  
25 and its implementation more prompt than anything which  
26 has previously transpired.

27 May I say here parenthetically whatever  
28 views on Metropolitan government we may hold, I am  
29 sure all the participating municipalities devoutly  
30 desire a long-term settlement of this vexatious





1 problem so we may all get on with the job of building  
2 a greater Toronto.

3 There are, as I see it, three broad  
4 alternative solutions to the present dilemma. Retain  
5 the present Metropolitan system with some minor re-  
6 shaping of the boundaries and redefining of areas  
7 of responsibility, or secondly, adopt a borough  
8 super city or other system of larger units within  
9 Metro, and finally, total amalgamation.

10 Support of the first suggestion would  
11 likely entail the adoption of a phase development  
12 to an eventual total amalgamation. It would also  
13 retain and prolong the evils which now plague  
14 Metropolitan Toronto. Those who propose amalgamation,  
15 service by service until all distinction ends must  
16 contend with the fact that prolonging the operation  
17 will only serve to foster the hostility and antagonism  
18 now besetting Metropolitan Toronto.

19 Since its inception Metropolitan Toronto  
20 has been faced with city-suburban antagonism which  
21 grew out of the city's initial application for amal-  
22 gamation. This internecine warpath has been nurtured  
23 by the Metropolitan administrative structure and  
24 by successive members from both factions.

25 We believe it is not humanly possible for  
26 a man to successfully move from one meeting where he  
27 is planning the growth and development of one  
28 municipality and go on to another meeting where he  
29 is called upon to submerge his primary loyalty for  
30 the good of a greater community. We believe it places







1 an intolerable strain on even the most dedicated of  
2 men, and as the obvious inequities increase so does  
3 the strain even to the breaking point. We believe  
4 that this atmosphere is ultimately fatally damaging to  
5 the prospect of a unified community.

6 We believe the Metropolitan form of  
7 government is deterring the orderly growth in this  
8 area because, firstly, it does not conform to the  
9 ancient principle of representation by population.  
10 Secondly, it places inequitable tax burdens on member  
11 municipalities, and thirdly, its administration is  
12 overburdened with duplication in policy and practice,  
13 a duplication which is causing irreparable damage  
14 to the whole community.

15 To chip and snip at the map or the  
16 charts of authority and responsibility would be an  
17 abortive waste of time. It would leave the funda-  
18 mental problems begging and could only delay still  
19 further the judgment day when we must face the fact  
20 that to ensure the proper growth of this great urban  
21 area we need a single government, a single adminis-  
22 tration, a single set of policies.

23 The chief attraction of the borough  
24 system, whether they be four, five or six, is supposed  
25 to be that it avoids the bogeyman of bigness, the  
26 frightening prospect of hundreds of thousands of  
27 nameless, faceless people whose destiny is controlled  
28 by people they barely discern and rarely know. We  
29 suspect its real charm lies in the fact that it  
30 supplies more jobs for politicians than amalgamation





1 does, and we all know how painfully unemployed an  
2 out-of-work politician can be.

3           Size. As long as proper safeguards are  
4 provided size is in itself no true obstacle to effec-  
5 tive representative government. In our brief you  
6 will find reference to the fact that more than forty  
7 cities in the world have a population greater than  
8 that of our entire Metropolitan area. If units of  
9 representation are small enough to give the citizen  
10 easy access to his representative, satisfaction for  
11 complaints, redress for wrongs and effective participa-  
12 tion in municipal decisions, then size alone is not  
13 a sufficient barrier to the smooth democratic adminis-  
14 tration of a city.

15           The borough system still suffers from  
16 the same fatal defect as the present Metropolitan  
17 plan. It leaves the inner municipalities with no  
18 room for growth, and a continuing need for urban  
19 renewal; the outer municipalities with fresh  
20 growth and all its attendant problems, and an over-  
21 riding metropolitan government presiding over the  
22 desperate death struggle of each. It does not solve  
23 or mitigate the problem of the core city which stands  
24 helpless as its people, its industry and its life  
25 blood takes flight to the suburbs. It is left to  
26 fight the battle against encroaching urban blight  
27 while trying to provide essential services and  
28 facilities which are the true focus of any city's  
29 existence.

30           Before we pass on to an examination of our







1 proposal for amalgamation, we would like to consider for  
2 a moment what are the ingredients of a city. It is  
3 not merely a device of rhetoric when we point out that  
4 a city is infinitely greater than a mere cataloguing  
5 of its people and services, its policies and practices,  
6 its industries and institutions. It is absurd to  
7 suggest that a city can be created by running a line  
8 around a piece of mapping paper. As the men at  
9 Versailles discovered, any state, city state or  
10 national state must have internal vitality which  
11 welds it together. No amount of political gerry-  
12 mandering, stumping oratory or administrative machinery  
13 can substitute for the feeling of identification  
14 that a city's residents have. That identification  
15 rises from a central source; the city provides  
16 features which instil a feeling of belonging, of  
17 loyalty and pride. The simple fact of living in  
18 close proximity to great institutions of government,  
19 education, culture and entertainment gives a citizen  
20 that feeling of identification.

21 It is easy to talk of creating four,  
22 five or six so-called cities, but they would no more  
23 be true in the truest sense than would King City,  
24 the neighbour we are delighted to have on our fringe.  
25 It is easy to talk of the necessity of retaining  
26 loyalty and allegiance to the small comprehensive  
27 political unit, but the fact remains that the citizen  
28 of Weston or North York or Scarborough who travels  
29 to Montreal or New York is proud to say that he is  
30 from Toronto.





1 On a very personal note I may say a large  
2 percentage of the invitations which cross the desk of  
3 the Mayor of Toronto are from people and organizations  
4 in other metro municipalities for events in other  
5 municipalities. These invitations come because in  
6 the population's mind these people are living in  
7 Toronto and the mayor is the mayor not only of all  
8 of the people but also all of the city.

9 When the Metropolitan Toronto<sup>Convention</sup> and Visitor  
10 Association publicizes this city, they point with  
11 understandable pride to the University of Toronto,  
12 Royal Ontario Museum, the Art Gallery of Toronto,  
13 the Maple Leaf Gardens, the Canadian National Exhibition,  
14 Queens Park, seat of provincial government, Casa Loma,  
15 harbour facilities, to places of entertainment, to  
16 the great theatres and concert halls. The unassailable  
17 fact is that all of these are within the confines of  
18 the City of Toronto, and what is probably more rele-  
19 vant, virtually every one of them, every one of these  
20 organizations is on tax free land sterilized now  
21 and forever from municipal taxation, and we in Toronto  
22 carry the burden. The city is called upon to  
23 provide, assist and even subsidize services and  
24 institutions which serve the entire Metro polulation  
25 and beyond.

26 The fact is that the lunch pail carriers  
27 of Scarborough, East York, North York, Etobicoke and  
28 other Metro communitities desperately need the leisure  
29 time facilities provided by the City of Toronto if  
30 their lives are not to be a sterile round of work and







1 drudgery.

2 From the city's point of view the inequities  
3 in the present Metropolitan system are growing every  
4 day. Here is a partial catalogue. Firstly, the  
5 City of Toronto is called upon every year to support,  
6 through its grant to Metropolitan Toronto, services  
7 which are draining the city's vitality. For example,  
8 as a participating member in Metro, the city is  
9 contributing to the Don Valley Parkway and the Gardiner  
10 Expressway. Both these arteries are making it  
11 attractive to more people to move to the suburbs,  
12 and still have easy access to their downtown places  
13 of employment. They are also making the suburbs more  
14 attractive to industry and commerce. The result is  
15 that we in Toronto are losing our people; the popula-  
16 tion in Toronto has made no firm gains in the last  
17 thirty years. We are losing our commercial and  
18 industrial assessment.

19 The second inequity, the City of Toronto  
20 is now in an inequitable position as far as population  
21 is concerned. Granted in the early days Toronto  
22 was in a different position and deserved equal  
23 representation on Metro Council. Now, we have only  
24 one-third the population and still have half the  
25 representation. Both then and now we supported  
26 amalgamation based on proper representation, and we  
27 find the present situation no less inequitable when  
28 the balance has swung in our favour than we did pre-  
29 viously. In 1953 the city had 59 per cent of the  
30 population and 50 per cent of the seats. We now





1 have about 38 per cent of the population and still  
2 have 50 per cent of the seats. What is even more  
3 grossly unfair is the inequity as between suburban  
4 municipalities. As our brief points out, North York  
5 has about 32 times the population of Swansea, 33 times  
6 its taxable assessment, 65 times its area, and 116  
7 times its taxable acreage yet each, Swansea and  
8 North York, have equal representation on the Metro Coun-  
9 cil and School Board.

10 A third inequity, Metropolitan Toronto  
11 has never achieved a satisfactory division of her  
12 responsibilities. We point to the Harbour Commission  
13 which the City of Toronto operates as a joint trust  
14 with the federal Government. The best estimate which  
15 can be reached is that at least half the goods moving  
16 through the port of Toronto have suburban destinations.  
17 The Harbour Commission is constantly dealing with  
18 Metropolitan organizations such as Metro Parks Depart-  
19 ment operating the Island Park, the Roads Department  
20 buying land for the development of the Gardiner  
21 Expressway, the Metro Works Department which operates  
22 its own marine yard, dredges and tugs. There is  
23 ample evidence that the harbour, if it is to maintain  
24 its pre-eminent position along Lake Ontario, should  
25 be operated on an areawide basis. A Metro unification  
26 would accomplish that goal, but it is certain that  
27 until the government becomes an areawide responsibility  
28 the city would be ill-advised to give up the long-  
29 term assets represented by its harbour facilities.

30 The same, of course, applies to the Canadian







1 National Exhibition and the University of Toronto which  
2 serve an area much wider than they were intended to  
3 serve many years ago when they were originated.

4 Well, sir, that is enough of what we are  
5 "agin". Let us look at what we are for. I would  
6 like to remind you, sir, that the City of Toronto  
7 has since 1950 been a consistent supporter of amalga-  
8 mation. We believe that city government is the  
9 natural recognized form of municipal government. We  
10 believe the time has now come for extending that form  
11 of government to the entire Metro area.

12  
13 -

14  
15  
16 -

17  
18  
19 -

20  
21  
22 -

23  
24  
25 -

26  
27  
28 -





1 We support the following seven-point  
2 programme of organization for this proposed metropolis:

3 Firstly, divide the area into at least  
4 24 wards with an approximate population of 70,000  
5 each.

6 Secondly, group wards into districts  
7 containing 4 or more wards.

8 Thirdly, provide for a review of ward  
9 boundaries every ten years based on the latest DBS  
10 census statistics.

11 Fourthly, each ward in each district  
12 should elect 1 alderman and then each district would  
13 elect 1 controller.

14 Sixthly, controllers would be nominated  
15 from a single district but would be subjected to a  
16 vote by all the districts.

17 Seventh, the mayor should be nominated,  
18 elected by general vote through the entire area.

19 These proposals would eliminate the element  
20 of competition between aldermen representing a single  
21 ward. They would assure that no controller could  
22 sacrifice area-wide needs to purely parochial interests  
23 and they would assure that the mayor truly represented  
24 the entire population.

25 You, sir, I am sure, will be familiar with  
26 that principle of logic which suggests that where  
27 there are several alternatives which account for all  
28 the facts the one to be preferred is whichever is  
29 simplest.

30 We suggest that perhaps the greatest







1 virtue of the City's proposal is this very  
2 simplicity. The advantage it has over all other  
3 proposals is twofold. It is simple and it is eminently  
4 practicable.

5 We make no recommendations as to  
6 specific ward boundaries, but our brief gives a de-  
7 tailed analysis of potential growth patterns and fore-  
8 sees the day when development beyond the point of the  
9 present Metropolitan Toronto might be feasible.

10 It is in fact a very real possibility that  
11 the next Metro phase in developing this area could be  
12 making the present Metropolitan Toronto the core city  
13 for a new Metropolitan Toronto which extends to the  
14 municipalities now contiguous with Metro.

15 I have in these remarks avoided details  
16 and statistical treatment of the evidence. That has  
17 been left to the competent and exhaustive brief pre-  
18 pared for the City by its consultants. We have tried,  
19 however, to state in general terms the City's convic-  
20 tions about amalgamation.

21 There have been advanced many arguments  
22 of sentiment and emotion about attachments to old  
23 names and old places. I remind you, sir, that the  
24 residents of Toronto still talk with affection and even  
25 pride of communities like Parkdale, Rosedale, the Annex,  
26 Todmorden, Yorkville and so on -- communities  
27 which long ago gave up their separate corporate exis-  
28 tence and merged their destinies with that of a  
29 greater metropolis.

30 There is no doubt in my mind that the





1 merger, the growth, the expansion we now contemplate  
2 will leave in its wake loyalties and affection for  
3 the names we now love and respect.

4 There is no thought in our minds, nor  
5 indeed those of our citizens, that this is an operation  
6 in which Goliath (Toronto) turns the tables to swallow  
7 up the David suburbanites. We do not conceive this  
8 as an operation of destruction, death or debilitation.  
9 We are persuaded that it is in all our interests to  
10 forego the petty, parochial and vindictive attachment  
11 to places and things, to outworn tendencies, to out-  
12 dated modes of thought and operation.

13 It is possible, sir, that I shall be the  
14 last Mayor of Toronto as it is now constituted. But  
15 I would want it known that I come here today to issue  
16 a new challenge. Municipal boundaries are artificial,  
17 synthetic, fleeting things at best. They, like law  
18 itself, are made for man.

19 What I hold out to you is the sure firm  
20 hope and expectation that there shall rise from this  
21 agony a city greater, richer and nobler than any we  
22 now comprehend.

23 I challenge you, sir, to preside not  
24 over the dissolution of an old, outmoded, antiquated  
25 system of government but rather the birth of a strong,  
26 hardy and vigorous city.

27 To our sister municipalities we say this.  
28 Whatever the results of this debate may be, our city  
29 and its citizens shall tomorrow as in the past be  
30 dedicated to the future benefit of thousands of our







1 fellow citizens. We shall then as always continue  
2 in the proud and honourable path we have walked these  
3 130 years of our existence.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Givens.

5 MR. GIVENS: That is the extent of my  
6 remarks.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I was going to say,  
8 Mr. Givens, using one of your own terms in the course  
9 of your remarks, having heard your eloquence I cannot  
10 envision you as an unemployable politician regardless  
11 of what happens.

12 MR. GIVENS: Thank you very much.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Hardy, you are  
14 going to proceed now?

15 MR. HARDY: Yes. Mr. Commissioner, I  
16 have observed the time table for the conduct of these  
17 hearings and I would like to take advantage of that  
18 time table by using the remainder of the morning and  
19 the time allotted this afternoon to discuss aspects  
20 of Toronto's submission before this Commission, to  
21 answer questions which you may have and to underline  
22 certain points which were covered in the brief.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You have the rest of  
24 the day, Mr. Hardy, and if necessary I will give you  
25 more time.

26 MR. HARDY: Thank you very much.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Proceed on that  
28 basis. The only thing I will ask you not to do is not  
29 to read the whole brief. I have read it twice. It  
30 is the biggest one of all.





1 MR. HARDY: Well, I have no intention of  
2 reading the whole brief at this time. I do want to  
3 spend a lot of time because there is a great deal of  
4 coverage in the brief and I think it is only reasonable  
5 to go over it.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

7 MR. HARDY: I propose to make some  
8 opening remarks of a somewhat different nature than  
9 the general statement of the City's position, which  
10 you have heard from the Mayor of Toronto, and then  
11 to proceed through the brief chapter by chapter. I  
12 would be very happy to have interruptions for questions  
13 at any time as I proceed. It will certainly not  
14 throw me off my stride and it may make it easier for  
15 us to deal with the subjects in this manner as we go  
16 rather than reserving a question until the end of  
17 my presentation.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I have too many  
19 questions for you to reserve them to the end. I  
20 propose to do exactly what you said.

21 MR. HARDY: Thank you very much, Mr.  
22 Commissioner. I may say that I welcome the questions  
23 and I shall certainly do my best to answer them to  
24 your satisfaction.

25 There is a manufacturer of men's sports  
26 clothing in Canada who puts on his garments the  
27 little slogan "As usual the unusual". This has  
28 been the means of his conducting a very successful  
29 manufacturing and selling business since he started  
30 it up at the end of World War II.







1                   This might be considered, I suppose, as  
2 a potential slogan for government considering the role  
3 of local government, which is said to be to experiment,  
4 to look at new ideas, to try them out and to see how  
5 they work.

6                   Such notable students of local government  
7 as the Webbs, Lord and Lady Parsfield, at one time  
8 suggested that the way to deal with municipal services  
9 in a flexible manner was to have tiny constituencies  
10 from which single members would be elected and then  
11 group these constituencies to form differing and over-  
12 lapping areas which would have responsibility for  
13 various services.

14                  Despite the number of overlapping juris-  
15 dictions that one finds in metropolitan cities I do not  
16 think this particular idea of the Webbs is to be  
17 commended, nor do I think that the slogan "As usual  
18 the unusual" is really a proper approach to government.

19                  In government we want to try and decide  
20 to form the basis for our principal action. If we  
21 get caught up in novel ideas we can in fact do great  
22 damage to the cause of good government, to the ends  
23 of the people of the Toronto area and other areas and  
24 the manner in which we provide government for them.

25                  Now I mention this point because it seems  
26 to me that as a result of the natural press coverage  
27 of the hearings, the discussions which have gone on of  
28 4 and 5 city systems, 6 city systems, 20 to 25  
29 city systems and so on, there is a genuine danger that  
30 the people of Toronto --although I think not the Royal





1 Commission charged with studying Metropolitan Toronto --  
2 may be taken in by an idea which is not adequate to  
3 meet the ongoing needs for government of the Greater  
4 Toronto area; in short, the borough system.

5           Despite the amount of talk which there  
6 has been about the borough system, it seems evident  
7 to me that many people have a limited knowledge of the  
8 borough system as to what it means, as to what real  
9 application it might have to the Toronto scene and  
10 as to why it is such an attraction for the suburban  
11 councils.     So I propose at the outset to spend a  
12 little time talking about the borough system as I  
13 understand it and considering these points as to its  
14 applicability to the Toronto area.

15           When I say that there seems to be less  
16 knowledge about the borough systems than prevalence  
17 of the word in discussion, I have been struck by the  
18 fact that in a number of the items I have been reading  
19 the word is not even spelled correctly and this has  
20 led me to conjecture somewhat whimsically whether  
21 the definition of a "boroughist" (a word I have heard used  
22 in the hearings) might be someone who is digging his  
23 head in the sand.

24           But more seriously, Mr. Commissioner, the  
25 name "borough" has a sort of magic ring about it which  
26 conjectures up something solid and truly British in  
27 the minds of people.     And yet we must know what a  
28 borough is, what a borough system is, what it can do  
29 for us, before we consider seriously extending and  
30 modifying this arrangement as the future form of







1 government of the Greater Toronto area. I say  
2 "extending" because we have the borough system now  
3 in a sense. According to the definition that I see  
4 of the term it is an urban area federation.

5 The borough system is actually the  
6 "unusual". There are a few examples of metropolitan  
7 federations in existence in the world. Some have  
8 come and gone, but as they stand now there are a few  
9 examples. We think of London right away. Those of  
10 us who are concerned with Canada's development in  
11 metropolitan government think of Winnipeg and the problems  
12 which the Winnipeg Metropolitan system has been under-  
13 going. Then in the United States the obvious example  
14 has been Miami, the Daytona County.

15 But what application has this to the needs  
16 of Toronto? What success does it have? How should  
17 we feel about it?

18 The Metropolitan Chairman in his pre-  
19 sentation included this statement, and I quote:  
20 "The value of another's experience cannot be ascer-  
21 tained without a full and complete comparison with the  
22 local picture." So I think it is unfortunate that  
23 for example the Village of Forest Hill made a good  
24 deal of the concluding comments in a luncheon address  
25 by Dr. Frank Smallwood, a person from the United States  
26 who had come to the Toronto area to study our metro-  
27 politan government, to analyse its problems and who  
28 was persuaded literally on the spur of the moment to  
29 come out with an opinion as to <sup>a</sup> suitable future form  
30 of government.





1                   It is fortunate, Mr. Commissioner, that  
2     you were actually in attendance at that luncheon be-  
3     cause in presenting ideas as to the future form of  
4     government Dr. Smallwood did acknowledge that he was  
5     expressing an opinion without a full exploration of  
6     the subject and he indicated that he was influenced  
7     in favouring this general concept because of his  
8     recent study of the London area -- the London, England  
9     area -- and an attraction to what he saw there. But  
10    in effect he was saying he had not explored the  
11    applicability of the borough plan to the Greater  
12    Toronto area.

13                  The borough system has been attractive  
14    to other students of government. I think for example  
15    of Dr. Albert Rose, to whom reference is made in the  
16    City's brief. Dr. Rose spoke not long ago to the  
17    Toronto Real Estate Board on this subject, and it  
18    became apparent to me in the course of his presenta-  
19    tion first of all that he quite readily acknowledged  
20    that neither the present populations nor boundary  
21    delineations would be fully satisfactory with the sort  
22    of borough system that he envisaged. But at the same  
23    time he did not advance a set of boundaries that would  
24    work today, let alone a set of boundaries which would  
25    be workable today and would remain so tomorrow. It  
26    seems to me that this has been a big problem about the  
27    borough system as it has been discussed for the  
28    Toronto area.

29                  In those borough proposals which have been  
30    brought forward by suburban councils it almost would







1 seem that their workability is in an inverse propor-  
2 tion to their acceptability. To get something which  
3 has a chance of workability you must twist and change  
4 to the point where every present municipal corpora-  
5 tion is distraught by what you are doing.

6 Actually another thing that seemed  
7 apparent from the advocacies of the borough plan  
8 was that their acceptability seemed to be increased  
9 in proportion to the extent to which they left definite  
10 decisions open and entrusted them to yourself, Mr.  
11 Commissioner.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not suggesting  
13 that was poor judgment, are you?  
14  
15  
16 -  
17  
18 -  
19  
20  
21 -  
22  
23  
24 -  
25  
26  
27 -  
28  
29  
30





1 MR. HARDY: I think it was excellent  
2 judgment, Mr. Commissioner, and I think further in  
3 leaving the subject open to you they may perhaps have  
4 recognized the subject was wide open to you, sir. You  
5 have the opportunity to produce a recommendation for  
6 the system which will do most for the good of everyone  
7 in the Greater Toronto area. Actually we feel that  
8 this method of dealing with the future form of  
9 government for Greater Toronto is highly suitable  
10 and satisfactory just for that very reason.

11 Now why is the borough system so  
12 attractive to the suburban municipalities? There  
13 is one thing that seems clear to me by reviewing the  
14 proposals which have been put forward by suburban  
15 municipalities, in any borough plans it has been  
16 advocated the sponsoring municipalities would not be  
17 worse off in so far as its boundaries were concerned  
18 under this borough proposal. In fact then these  
19 people have been making a case on behalf of their own  
20 corporations for something which would assist their  
21 corporations, and this is natural and to be expected.

22 It is a matter of how long a viewpoint  
23 people have of the subject. Our contention from  
24 Toronto is that the benefit which they are trying  
25 to obtain for themselves are short-term benefits.  
26 We think that Toronto's proposal is one which will  
27 be for the long-term good, not only of those within  
28 the present corporate limits of the city, but people  
29 throughout the whole Toronto area.

30 Now I refrain, Mr. Commissioner, from





1 mentioning one example of the position which municipi-  
2 palities appearing before you have taken, that it is  
3 in effect an advocacy on behalf of a corporation and  
4 not necessarily an attempt to look impartially at a  
5 problem.

6 The Town of New Toronto made an appli-  
7 cation to the Ontario Municipal Board within the last  
8 year or so, as perhaps a defensive reaction to the  
9 application of Long Branch for a Lakeshore merger.  
10 New Toronto sought the merger of the three Lakeshore  
11 municipalities, the full Township of Etobicoke, and  
12 the Malton area in Toronto Township. Then the  
13 representative of that same Lakeshore municipality  
14 appeared before this Commission and made a very win-  
15 ning presentation for the preservation of New Toronto  
16 as it is within its present boundaries. Surely this  
17 is an indication of the role that some municipalities  
18 see for themselves in appearing before this Commis-  
19 sion.

20 Now, Mr. Commissioner, I would like to  
21 turn and take a further look at the borough ideas of  
22 London and New York, a passing reference to New York  
23 and a more extended comment with reference to London,  
24 England.

25 As I see it both the London and New York  
26 considerations of a borough system was the result of  
27 political forces which invited compromise. In one  
28 case my analysis is that the forces of reaction  
29 triumphed and the City of London, which has not even  
30 reached the state of a representative government with







1 full adult suffrage but retains a medieval guild form  
2 and it was able to retain its identity in the face of  
3 the most logical arguments to the contrary.

4 In the instance of New York it first  
5 appeared that the same forces of reaction would be  
6 successful but the objective of a federated system of  
7 government was frustrated by amendments to the New  
8 York Bill passed in the State Legislature in Albany,  
9 cutting back the position of the boroughs until now,  
10 in the words of, I believe it was, Professor Munro,  
11 they became mere ghosts of boroughs.

12 Actually with reference to the New York  
13 form of government the political scientists are not  
14 prepared to describe it as a true borough system.  
15 What the boroughs have by way of rights is some  
16 very closely defined administrative discretion and  
17 this is not the political scientist's concept of  
18 the borough system. It is not the London plan, it  
19 is not the Winnipeg plan, and it is not the Toronto  
20 plan.

21 Now in London, England, the development  
22 of the borough system is a long story in terms of time.  
23 The borough system is in one sense a by-product of  
24 England's Reform Bill of 1832. It was supposed to  
25 be a merger which rode in double harness with the  
26 Municipal Corporation Act of 1835. A Royal Commission  
27 had been set up, sir, to consider the governmental  
28 requirements for English municipalities or English  
29 communities, because municipalities as such were  
30 non-existent, not many of them at the time.





1                   The work of this Royal Commission was  
2 divided into two parts as was done much more recently,  
3 for example, in the Committee Study which was Chaired  
4 by Premier Campbell in Manitoba when they looked at  
5 the governmental requirements in Manitoba.

6                   You will recall, I am sure, that one part  
7 of the report dealt with Metropolitan Winnipeg. One  
8 major subcommittee studied Metropolitan Winnipeg and  
9 the other studied the remainder of the province.

10                  I realize I am reminding you of things  
11 with which you are already very familiar. It is my  
12 purpose just to bring out these points. The Royal  
13 Commission which had hoped to report on the areas  
14 outside London first and shortly thereafter with  
15 respect to the London area delayed the report, which  
16 they had expected to issue no later than 1836, delayed  
17 it a full year, according to my understanding, because  
18 of the opposition of the City of London, that area of  
19 one square mile in the heart of the metropolis.

20                  Now in fact then the Royal Commission's  
21 report on London was delayed two years beyond action  
22 on the remainder of England and a longer period from  
23 the issuance of the report for the remainder of England,  
24 four years, I believe, but it took sixty-two years to  
25 obtain definitive action on the problem. I hope, Mr.  
26 Commissioner, I sincerely hope that we are more suc-  
27 cessful in this present instance.

28                  THE COMMISSIONER: If you don't get  
29 closer to 1964, you are just in 1835, it will take  
30 longer than you anticipate.







1 MR. HARDY: Mr. Commissioner, one more  
2 reference to the 1830's and we will get you to the turn  
3 of the century. In 1837 a report of the same Royal  
4 Commission included the sentence: "London must have a  
5 single and unified system of local government."

6 In 1899, sixty-two years later, when the  
7 form of government was evolved and implemented it was  
8 not a single system, but a two-level system. It was  
9 a two-level system which did not embrace even then  
10 anything like the whole of the metropolitan area.  
11 It has taken sixty-five years from the introduction  
12 of the two-level system to bring about its expansion  
13 to embrace those portions of the metropolitan area  
14 which were left outside.

15 Now in our report, Mr. Chairman, on page  
16 86 we make a brief reference to London which I want to  
17 read to you again. It is from Herman Finer's "English  
18 Local Government".

19 "In 1884 Sir William Harcourt introduced  
20 a bill drastically to reform London government.  
21 It met with the most determined opposition from  
22 the City of London and was defeated. Harcourt's  
23 London Government Bill planned to set up a  
24 single municipality for the whole of London,  
25 based on a reformed City Corporation with an  
26 extended area. The City of London obdurately  
27 opposed the Bill, and its methods were reminis-  
28 cent of Tammany Hall in New York City. The  
29 Lord Mayor exercised his right to sit in the  
30 House, and took a leading part in the agitation





1           against the Bill.   Thousands of pounds were  
2           spent by the city authorities on .hordings  
3           and advertisements in the newspapers and bullies  
4           were hired to break up reform meetings in all  
5           parts of London . . . But the movement for  
6           reform could no longer be obstructed, particular-  
7           ly when serious charges of corruption were  
8           levelled against the Metropolitan Board of  
9           Works in 1885."

10                   This quotation is intended to give people  
11           some indication of the climate in which a federated  
12           form of government was introduced for London, England.

13                   THE COMMISSIONER:   Are you quoting this  
14           as a threat?

15                   MR. HARDY:   I think it is obvious from  
16           the statement of the Mayor that we take a much more  
17           conciliatory attitude, Mr. Commissioner.

18                   THE COMMISSIONER:   What did the more  
19           recent Royal Commission decide? Did they decide to  
20           change the system?

21                   MR. HARDY:   Is this a reference to that  
22           quotation?

23                   THE COMMISSIONER:   No.   I am bringing  
24           you forward eighty years.

25                   MR. HARDY:   Yes.   The present London  
26           Commission, according to my understanding, undertook  
27           to extend the system and to change the system in some  
28           respects; actually to concentrate, and this is a matter  
29           of some debate, as I am sure you recognize, to extend  
30           the powers held by the local boroughs.           One must





1 bear in mind that to increase the population of these  
2 local boroughs you make bigger communities than for-  
3 merly, with stronger powers than formerly, but you  
4 retain the two-level system.

5 With respect to this arrangement there  
6 is an interesting point, it seems to me, Mr. Commissioner.  
7 Throughout the long years when the County of London,  
8 embracing 117 square miles of territory, or perhaps  
9 one-tenth of the metropolitan area, was in operation,  
10 a number of services remained separate from it under  
11 the control of special purpose bodies. There were  
12 actually seven major services which did then and do  
13 still remain outside of the control of the London  
14 County Council. There is drainage, embracing 5,000  
15 square miles of territory; electricity, where the  
16 special purpose body covers some 1,850 square miles;  
17 the Ports Authority, which is responsible for 69  
18 linear miles winding up the Thames River; the Police  
19 Authority, which covers some 700 square miles. This  
20 actually gave, in effect, the Royal Commission in  
21 London a set of boundaries which was their starting  
22 point to look at what might be a suitable area for  
23 enlargement of the metropolitan territory.

24 There is public transportation, where a  
25 single purpose body is responsible for some 2,000  
26 square miles of traffic and where the body which has  
27 been in charge over even a wider area is now to be  
28 displaced and this one function out of seven is to be  
29 taken into the federated system.

30 Now it seems to me the fact that six major







1 services still remain outside the federated plan,  
2 despite the legislative extension of the outer boundary  
3 line, is evidence of the nature of the new legislation  
4 as an adjustment to what is politically acceptable  
5 and not necessarily what is most efficient, effective  
6 on behalf of the people.

7 Mr. Commissioner, one thing that should  
8 be noted is it seems to me that London is the only area  
9 in the United Kingdom which has a federated form of  
10 urban government. Large places like Birmingham  
11 and Glasgow don't have this federation form. If  
12 we turn to the American cities we find the normal form  
13 of government for big cities is not a federation.  
14 New York with seven and a quarter million, Chicago  
15 with three and a half million, Philadelphia with two  
16 million, and Detroit with one and two-thirds million,  
17 all within their corporate limits operate as single  
18 cities.

19 Now it is true they have not solved the  
20 fringe problems, but neither had London until the  
21 passage of the recent Bill. This situation went on  
22 in London, as I say, for sixty-five years.

23 We have other big cities, such as Paris,  
24 Berlin, Hamburg, Vienna, all larger than Metro Toronto  
25 would become as an amalgamated city, or the enlarged  
26 City of Toronto would be in population. Two cities  
27 of interest, I think, are the two chief cities of  
28 Australia, where within the corporate limits you have  
29 considerably more population than Toronto. There  
30 are over two million in the case of Sydney and over





1 1,800,000 in the case of Melbourne.

2 Then there has, of course, been reference  
3 to your home City of Montreal, which is not as large  
4 as Toronto would be if there was the creation of a  
5 single city throughout the present Metropolitan area,  
6 but still it embraces a population of 1,200,000.

7 The City of Toronto has through this brief  
8 examined in detail its position under the federated  
9 form of government and it has developed detailed  
10 arguments with respect to that.

11  
12 -

13  
14  
15 -

16  
17  
18 -

19  
20  
21 -

22  
23  
24 -

25  
26  
27 -







1                   The City of Toronto as a result of what  
2 we feel is a thorough look at the broad question has  
3 come to what we regard as an inescapable conclusion  
4 that a single city would constitute a much preferred  
5 form of government to retention of the Metropolitan  
6 Federation in its present or in a modified form.

7                   It seems to us that the solution which  
8 Toronto is proposing is a relatively clear-cut pro-  
9 position, and that the real problems today centre  
10 around such questions as to the precise outer boundary  
11 lines which ought to be adopted at this time, and a  
12 form of organization which ought to be employed for  
13 the Council and the Administration.

14                  With respect to the outer boundary lines  
15 I would like to say one word because I feel that this  
16 problem must be kept in its proportions. We see  
17 nothing wrong with a Metropolitan area being linked  
18 with the satellite communities which lie beyond it  
19 for certain limited purposes, and we see some diffi-  
20 culty in defining the boundary line which is fairly  
21 satisfactory under today's conditions of growth and  
22 scatterization of urban population. However, we  
23 also see a definable boundary line which would pro-  
24 vide great progress for the Toronto area, and which  
25 would assist in the relationships of the Toronto area  
26 with the municipalities beyond.

27                  Back in 1950 when the Civic Advisory  
28 Council undertook a study of the governmental require-  
29 ments of the area, they included in their first report,  
30 Volume 1, a map which shows the Metropolitan area as





1 they conceived it at that time although it was not the  
2 Metropolitan area as defined by the Dominion Bureau of  
3 Statistics for census purposes. Indeed, at the time  
4 the DBS officials were working with Toronto people on  
5 the development of census maps, and they acknowledged  
6 that they had leaned very heavily on local opinion  
7 as to what was practical in defining the Metropolitan  
8 area then, and this was the reason perhaps for the  
9 divergence. Actually the two Metropolitan areas are  
10 today much closer together because DBS has gone beyond  
11 the county line.

12 The map which was included in that report  
13 indicated the extent of continuous or nearly continuous  
14 urban development east and west and north from the area  
15 which was then the city, and in respect to which the  
16 immediate suburban areas beyond are embraced by it.

17 We have a map in this report, Mr. Commis-  
18 sioner, to which I refer you. It is on page 98.  
19 This map has been taken from a map contained in the  
20 draft official plan of the Metropolitan Planning Body,  
21 and it delineates not only the outer line of existing  
22 urban development but the outer line to which urban  
23 development, intensive and continued urban development,  
24 can be held in the opinion of the planning people.

25 I suggest to you by looking at this map,  
26 and we have compared it with what was regarded as the  
27 Metro area by the Civic Advisory Council some ten years  
28 ago, one reaches the conclusion that an enclosure of  
29 the Toronto area which would undoubtedly serve for  
30 twenty years could be worked out with an addition of





1 not more than five per cent of population beyond what is  
2 contained within the municipality of Metropolitan  
3 Toronto.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: What additional per  
5 cent in territory, area?

6 MR. HARDY: I have not worked out the  
7 area, Mr. Commissioner. If you look at the map there  
8 facing page 99 what I have as the maximum area is that  
9 one would take the areas marked in white in Markham  
10 and Vaughan, areas marked in white into Pickering,  
11 and moving into Toronto Township, one would take some  
12 arbitrary cut-off point since there is urban develop-  
13 ment which proceeds onwards through the enlarged  
14 Oakville and over to the Hamilton area, and we have  
15 made the point in the brief that both east and west  
16 to some extent an arbitrary cut-off line is required  
17 because it would be unreasonable, entirely unreasonable  
18 to suggest for any form of government, federation or  
19 unitary, you should extend that governmental area  
20 geographically from Oshawa to and beyond Hamilton.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Is this the area you  
22 think should be included in an amalgamated City of  
23 Toronto. I was referring to the area of this map.

24 MR. HARDY: Yes.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Where you take in the  
26 larger part of Toronto Township, a considerable part  
27 of Pickering and parts of Vaughan and Markham; is this  
28 what you recommend should be the boundary?

29 MR. HARDY: No, Mr. Commissioner.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I did not think so.







1 Would you proceed then?

2 MR. HARDY: Yes. I will explain what  
3 we do recommend and why I referred to this and what the  
4 relationship seems to me to be. The City of Toronto  
5 has devoted a very considerable amount of space in  
6 its report to what we call "a look at boundaries"  
7 starting on page 92 and running through to page 104.  
8 We come up with the city's position on pages 103 and  
9 104. I do not know whether you would like me to  
10 read those seven points here.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Read them.

12 MR. HARDY: Thank you. The first,  
13 "It is plainly impossible to arrive at an incontestable  
14 decision as to the appropriate outer boundary for an  
15 amalgamated city." An uncontestable decision.

16 "(2) Nothing less than the present  
17 limits of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto  
18 will suffice in light of the substantial beachhead  
19 of common government administration which has been  
20 established."

21 We regard that as important. If I may  
22 refer for one second to the map facing page 99, sir,  
23 you will see that it is expected that the northeast  
24 corner of Scarborough will be urbanized in the planning  
25 forecast of the planning authority. It is conceivable  
26 that that small portion of Scarborough might actually  
27 be removed from the territories of an amalgamated  
28 city. But then you face immediately the question of  
29 what the fate of that area will be which is left out-  
30 side, and how will it parallel or conflict with the





1 expectations of the people who live and own property  
2 in that area.

3 We are concerned with their expectations  
4 that they are under urban government and that one has  
5 to think of this in any possible reduction of that  
6 line.

7 The third point then as to the city's  
8 position: "On the west, whatever line is adopted  
9 must represent to a very considerable extent an  
10 arbitrary cut-off point." In that respect, again  
11 turning to the map, Mr. Commissioner, we have examined  
12 the western area on the ground and from the air, and  
13 we have studied densities on maps, and so on; dis-  
14 cussed this with our planning staff. There is a  
15 very real point that on the northwest the airport  
16 actually constitutes a barrier so that one senior  
17 official in the Department of Municipal Affairs said  
18 to me the other day "The airport makes Bramalea a  
19 true satellite and gives them a prospect of con-  
20 tinuing as such."

21 Therefore, it is a question where the  
22 airport would lie in relation to the boundary, but it  
23 would be a contiguous point either in or out if you  
24 assume it was useful in this area and its purposes  
25 could be served in other ways by making use of the  
26 airport in this manner. We have also in that area  
27 the ravine -- I think it is the Etobicoke Creek ravine  
28 that runs through there, and the land is very uneven.  
29 You have the New Woodbine Racecourse which makes for  
30 an effective barrier actually so that it is only from







1 the middle of Toronto Township southwards that you  
2 have a more continuous line of urban development.

3 Then in the Port Credit area actually as  
4 the development goes today you have a tongue of  
5 undeveloped land stretching down towards Port Credit  
6 so that one could think of a cut-off point there.  
7 This is all debatable.

8 Returning to the city's position, Mr.  
9 Commissioner, the fourth point, "Any westerly extension  
10 from the present boundary must be worked out in re-  
11 lation to the development of a satisfactory and viable  
12 pattern of urban government in the territories beyond."  
13 This point might have been applied more generally. It  
14 seems to us this is a very important responsibility  
15 upon the government when it comes to legislating on  
16 this whole subject.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: It is within my Terms  
18 of Reference.

19 MR. HARDY: Oh, yes. I might have put  
20 it the other way: we think it is very important to you  
21 in framing your recommendations, sir. Then the next  
22 point, "Specifically, the inclusion of Malton within  
23 Toronto would not be warranted if it meant the imposi-  
24 tion of tax hardship on Toronto Township." We do  
25 think that under the existing arrangements of local  
26 revenue raising, account must be taken of the  
27 financial implications of boundary changes, and if  
28 boundary changes are proposed which would have in-  
29 equitable results, which would create hardship for  
30 certain areas, these changes ought not to be





1 contemplated unless the financial hardship can at the  
2 same time be eliminated or very greatly curtailed.

3 The sixth point, "The question of Pickering  
4 Township's future poses a serious problem for its  
5 people and involves broader issues than the commuter  
6 relationship with Toronto. If it can be shown that  
7 annexation to Toronto of the southwest portion of the  
8 township is an element of the best solution to the  
9 township's problems Toronto should be prepared to  
10 accept the responsibility." In other words, we say  
11 that we are looking for a fair and reasonable boundary  
12 line which gives all the municipalities situated within  
13 the area and its environs a viable and workable  
14 position, and Toronto in seeking an enlargement of  
15 its boundaries is attempting to assist you, sir, in  
16 defining what that line would be.

17 We think it is a highly complicated pro-  
18 blem and one in which it would be unreasonable for us  
19 to come down flatly on one particular line without an  
20 ability to prescribe governmental changes in the areas  
21 which lie beyond.

22 The seventh point, "In due course, an  
23 amalgamated city must anticipate a further enlargement  
24 to the north. This development should probably be  
25 postponed, provided it is not in reality being aban-  
26 doned. Before any such annexation takes place,  
27 provision will have to be made to safeguard the  
28 future of York County."

29 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say the city  
30 must anticipate a further enlargement to the north, you





1 mean beyond this line on Map 5?

2 MR. HARDY: No, sir.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Beyond the present  
4 boundary?

5 MR. HARDY: Within that line and beyond  
6 the present boundary, and of course the extent of the  
7 northerly extension that may be called for in the  
8 future is dependent upon the controls, effective  
9 controls as to urban land use which apply over the  
10 intervening years.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: I take it, Mr. Hardy,  
12 that for the amalgamated city which you recommend, you  
13 are recommending as a minimum the present boundaries  
14 of the Metropolitan municipality?

15 MR. HARDY: Yes.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: But you go on to say  
17 that these boundaries should actually be extended in  
18 certain directions, but you are not in a position to  
19 recommend specific boundaries?

20 MR. HARDY: Nor the precise timing of  
21 that extension. On that point I might say that we  
22 feel that Metro has served the purpose of giving this  
23 area a leg-up, as it were. It has created common  
24 government over a certain broad area. This is the  
25 area where it is most readily possible to proceed to  
26 the next stage and merge it as a city. To extend  
27 beyond this line takes one into problems which are  
28 different and more complicated and which not only  
29 have to be recognized but which have to be overcome  
30 before, in all fairness, the line could be extended







1 further.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, assuming that the  
3 Metropolitan area were amalgamated as you recommend,  
4 you have said that the new amalgamated city will have  
5 to establish certain links with the urban areas and  
6 satellites outside of its boundaries. Are you sug-  
7 gesting a new Metropolitan corporation which would  
8 include the big city and other areas?

9 MR. HARDY: We are prepared to see that  
10 happen. This is one alternative as to what might  
11 happen. I discussed the subject, Mr. Commissioner,  
12 as I think you know from our brief, with all depart-  
13 mental officials, all the staff heads, all local boards,  
14 with every member of Council, and so on, and in my  
15 discussions with them I found, for example, some  
16 disposition to believe that part of the planning  
17 responsibility which is now in the hands of local  
18 government might better be performed directly at the  
19 provincial level.

20 Then I encountered something there which  
21 I have encountered repeatedly over the last five years  
22 in various contexts, and that is the belief that the  
23 county system and the units of government generally  
24 in Southern Ontario which now exist are in need of  
25 revamping themselves; that the county boundaries are  
26 inappropriate to the present needs; that one might  
27 very well consider a realignment of county boundaries  
28 in relation to the great urban belt which we live in  
29 here and other urban agglomerates, Kitchener-Galt area,  
30 the London area, and so on. Therefore it seems to





1 us that while what/<sup>one</sup>might call a new Metro for a  
2 larger area might be one way of attacking this  
3 problem, it is not the only constructive way of  
4 approaching it. However, if this is the way of  
5 your recommendation, I am quite certain from my dis-  
6 cussions that the City of Toronto would support this  
7 idea. In other words, a limited upper tier relation-  
8 ship of a city with its true satellite fringe we  
9 regard as quite sensible; quite legitimate.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You are admitting  
11 there, of course, you have no objection to the prin-  
12 ciple of metropolitan government.

13 MR. HARDY: This is correct. We do not  
14 object to the existence of a limited purpose , second-  
15 tier arrangement, appropriately conceived in terms of  
16 area and functions, but we say that the area which is  
17 one metropolis ought to have one government for its main  
18 purposes, and just as Metro Toronto today is in  
19 partnership with the County of York in the provision  
20 of all the county roads except a little stretch in  
21 the Town of Newmarket, we pay half the local costs  
22 from Metro.

23 -

26 -

29 -







1 Just as they are in partnership with the  
2 County of York in the administration of justice, just  
3 as their relationships on the expansion of water  
4 supply and sewage disposal and planning out beyond  
5 Metro proper, we think such relationships beyond an  
6 enlarged city are appropriate.

7 Now if they are all put in one package  
8 and called a government, this is a little different  
9 from what we have had historically and what we think  
10 is reasonable to expect in the future, provided that  
11 the ingredients in the package are appropriate and the  
12 boundary lines in relation to this concept are related  
13 to the constructive purposes which ought to be served.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, as  
15 long as Toronto as the present Metropolitan area is  
16 amalgamated into one big city you are prepared to  
17 accept a new Metro which will include that big city  
18 and the urban areas outside of its boundaries?

19 MR. HARDY: Yes, but for quite limited  
20 purposes. You see, we contend that the need to  
21 create this partnership for services would be much  
22 more limited with that wider boundary line than it is  
23 today. In fact we contend today that the need is that  
24 the partnership should be with respect to all services.  
25 That is in effect one way of building our case for  
26 amalgamation. You can build it service by service  
27 in my opinion.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you going to  
29 start on a new section now, because I would like to  
30 adjourn at 12.30?





1 MR. HARDY: May I just then make one more  
2 comment with respect to the subject matter we have  
3 been dealing with and this then provides a convenient  
4 breaking point for me?

5 THE COMMISSIONER: I was thinking of your  
6 convenience. Also, Mr. Hardy, if you want to sit  
7 down, I know what it is as a lawyer to have to stand  
8 and argue for hours. It is up to you entirely.

9 MR. HARDY: Thank you very much, sir. I  
10 just want to reiterate the point that we made with  
11 respect to the outer boundary line, or the point I  
12 made in my verbal statement which is not contained  
13 specifically in the brief but which I feel needs to  
14 be emphasized in the light of the contentions which  
15 are being advanced by those concerned with the  
16 governmental arrangement for the Toronto area.

17 My point is that the widest enlargement  
18 of boundaries which, with suitable arrangements for the  
19 areas beyond, ought to be contemplated in our opinion,  
20 and which ought to be fully satisfactory in our opinion  
21 to deal with the problem of urban growth for twenty  
22 years, would involve not more than and I would think  
23 considerably less than 5 per cent addition to the  
24 population within the existing Metropolitan boundary  
25 line. I think this is very important.

26 What we want to do here is to keep this  
27 whole problem in its proportions. It has been sug-  
28 gested that this whole Toronto area is going to go  
29 on growing like the overflow from some Pandora's box,  
30 and that we have here an uncontrollably wild





1 phenomenon of growth which means that we cannot have  
2 manageable government under the normal forms of  
3 government.

4 Our contention is that the Metropolitan  
5 planning people have put valid evidence forward as to  
6 the real potential of containing this great city so  
7 that boundary adjustments do not need to be effected  
8 more frequently than is reasonable. We are not  
9 suggesting that this is a solution once and for all  
10 which will solve Toronto's problems for the next  
11 one hundred years, and we say this -- and it is  
12 something which I am sure is obvious to yourself --  
13 that is, that it is part of the nature of local  
14 government that boundaries must be extended to  
15 parallel urban growth, to take account of urban growth.  
16 One expects in local government that yearly adjust-  
17 ments will take place that relate to the steady  
18 progression of urbanization, whereas for a province  
19 or a country we expect that the boundaries will remain  
20 fixed.

21 One of the responsibilities of the pro-  
22 vince, which has an overall responsibility for local  
23 government, is to look after this whole question of  
24 enlargement of boundaries. In this report we have  
25 pointed out to you -- and I want merely to stress it  
26 at this time -- that in respect to Ontario's 32  
27 cities or less -- say, with respect to the 31 cities  
28 other than Toronto, very substantial enlargements of  
29 boundaries have been effected under the province aegis  
30 for 25 of them.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: You think those  
2 cases which I read with considerable interest are  
3 really relevant to the Metropolitan Toronto situation?  
4 You have Eastview with a population of 25,000, Owen  
5 Sound with a population of 17,000, Brockville, 17,000.  
6 Do you think they offer an analogy?

7 MR. HARDY: Would you tell me the page?

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I have it in your  
9 original typewritten document. It must be in the  
10 brief. I only received this, as you know, over the  
11 weekend -- the printed one.

12 MR. HARDY: Oh, yes, I have the page.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: What page is it?

14 MR. HARDY: It is starting at 63, the  
15 tabular material at pages 64 and 65.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: My question related  
17 to Table 3, where you refer to annexations in a large  
18 number of municipalities. As I see it you begin  
19 with the City of Ottawa. You go on to Hamilton.  
20 I was questioning whether these are really relevant  
21 to the Toronto situation when you bear in mind that  
22 one municipality alone -- North York has a larger  
23 population than any one of them, and Scarborough is  
24 larger than any one of them except Ottawa and Hamilton.

25 MR. HARDY: Perhaps I might answer in  
26 this way. Some years ago the Province of Ontario  
27 developed and introduced a system of graded unconditional  
28 grants and at the time the gradation ran from \$4 per  
29 capita for Metropolitan Toronto downwards to, I think  
30 it was about \$1.50 per capita. Now the municipalities





1 which came closest to Toronto in this graded per  
2 capita scaling, Ottawa and Hamilton, were to receive  
3 grants, as I recall it, of \$2.75 per capita.

4 What I am suggesting to you is that we  
5 have here a gradation, a difference in degree, but also  
6 it becomes a difference in kind as it grows in size.

7 We put this in because we think that even  
8 in the very large metropolis the point still holds that  
9 the province has a responsibility to take account of  
10 its growth and to alter boundaries in accordance  
11 with growth. We do not suggest that the situations  
12 are identical. We suggest that there is a similarity  
13 and there is a closer parallel the larger the area  
14 becomes. The parallel is much closer for example  
15 between Ottawa and Toronto than it is between Owen  
16 Sound and Toronto.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: But even in the case  
18 of Ottawa, the annexation of which you and I know,  
19 there is nothing comparable to a municipality like  
20 North York or Scarborough or York or East York. It  
21 was Gloucester that was annexed to Ottawa.

22 MR. HARDY: The Nepean of Gloucester.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: The Nepean, and it is  
24 quite normal for relatively small metropolitan areas  
25 to proceed by annexation.

26 MR. HARDY: Mr. Commissioner, if you  
27 study the population additions to the cities where they  
28 have had what I call block annexations I think there  
29 does emerge a very real parallel to the situation  
30 which faced Toronto back in 1950.







1 amalgamate because of its financial difficulties.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That was Windsor,  
3 Walkerville and so on -- four of them.

4 MR. HARDY: Yes, four of them. Then  
5 you come to 1962 or thereabouts when a first interim  
6 report came out from the Municipal Board and they  
7 denied a similar enlargement of boundaries on the  
8 grounds -- it seemed to me the principal ground was  
9 that Windsor could not afford it. It was a complete  
10 reversal of attitude. And here we have coming back  
11 in the Windsor Economic Committee of the Ontario Economic  
12 Council and contesting the attitude taken by the  
13 Municipal Board in, I acknowledge, breaking down an  
14 interim proposal. This was not intended to be a  
15 final proposal.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: I want you to know I  
17 am not taking a position. I merely raised this ques-  
18 tion because of the municipalities cited in your  
19 brief. You mention another enlargement. You men-  
20 tion Uranium City. The population of Uranium City  
21 is 4,000.

22 MR. HARDY: Quite so, quite so.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not dealing  
24 with the same type of municipality -- or the rural  
25 municipalities in Saskatchewan, which I know very well.  
26 There is no comparison there.

27 MR. HARDY: Well, the comparison was  
28 intended, Mr. Commissioner, to be quite limited in  
29 its application. It was limited to the point which  
30 we brought it in for; that is, the attitudes of





1 people to boundary changes.

2 Now I think we would be quite wrong if  
3 we suggested that the problems represented a close  
4 parallel, but they are in the same field and this  
5 runs, as I say it, all through local government --  
6 the need to make adjustments both in rural and urban  
7 areas for somewhat different reasons to the boundaries  
8 which have been established and have operated his-  
9 torically.

10 It is in that context and for that pur-  
11 pose that these figures are brought in. But I do  
12 want to outline again this further point that if you  
13 look at the larger cities of Ontario -- Windsor was  
14 one example where the solution is pending. London;  
15 if you look at its enlargement from 79,000, well now,  
16 with its enlargement it was at the time of the  
17 annexation about 102,000 population and it is now  
18 up to the 1962 figure; they are 166,000. In other  
19 words it certainly added well over 50 per cent to its  
20 population.

21 The same was true of the St. Catharines  
22 area. It was even more so of the Welland area. The  
23 Niagara Falls added a larger municipality than itself  
24 and so did Cornwall.

25 These are the kinds of boundary changes  
26 which have resulted from a delay which has called for  
27 a one-time extension form of change to catch up  
28 on the lack of boundary adjustments over a period of  
29 years in the past.

30 Mr. Commissioner, I wanted to deal with





1 that subject. We have dealt with it a little longer  
2 than I had intended. If that is all you want to raise  
3 with respect to it now I would be glad to break off  
4 at this point.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: You missed one annexa-  
6 tion. The City of Montreal annexed the Village of  
7 Saraguay with a population of 500.

8 Will two o'clock be all right to you  
9 or would you like a few minutes more, because I know  
10 how tiring it is.

11 MR. HARDY: Two is fine.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn until  
13 two o'clock.

14  
15  
16 ----Luncheon adjournment.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







1 ---UPON RESUMING AT 2:10 P.M.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you ready to  
3 proceed, Mr. Hardy?

4 MR. HARDY: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. I  
5 should like now, Mr. Commissioner, to proceed through  
6 the brief, touching on some points here and there. We  
7 have covered a good deal of material with respect to  
8 a couple of chapters and I will try and go more lightly  
9 on those. I probably won't say anything more on them  
10 unless you have questions.

11 As I said this morning I certainly  
12 will be delighted to have questions from you at any  
13 time that suits your convenience.

14 Now, proceeding through the brief in  
15 chronological order makes not for as exciting a  
16 presentation as one would like but I would like to  
17 emphatically emphasize certain matters which seem to  
18 the City of Toronto to be important and which are  
19 mentioned in the brief. Because we think they are  
20 important they need, we feel, this extra stress in  
21 verbal submission.

22 The City acknowledges at the outset  
23 that part of the responsibility for the existence of  
24 our present governmental problem is in a corporate sense  
25 theirs. Annexations to the City of major consequence  
26 ceased in 1912. The only large annexation since that  
27 time is one that caused no protest from the inhabitants  
28 because it was part of Mount Pleasant cemetery.

29 The City seriously does take this  
30 responsibility and recognizes that the problem of the





1 Province in fulfilling its role as the sponsor and  
2 overseer of local government has been rendered more  
3 difficult by the legal but none the less unfortunate  
4 attitudes which governed the Toronto scene for a number  
5 of years when additions to territory were possible and  
6 were not carried out.

7                   Now perhaps because of this historical  
8 background the City was doubly anxious to cooperate in  
9 Metro when this was the legislation brought down.  
10 Before the legislation was actually introduced into the  
11 House the City Council protested, not only dissented  
12 but protested strongly. I was at the meeting in 1953  
13 and I recall the very forthright attitude, the very  
14 strong position taken by members of the Board of  
15 Control and Council that Metro was the wrong move for  
16 the Province to be making and they hoped the recommendation  
17 from the Municipal Board would not be picked up in  
18 legislation.

19                   Now it was picked up with some changes,  
20 changes which have been questioned in this hearing as  
21 to their wisdom and the City did cooperate and for  
22 that reason when a Committee of Review was established  
23 and held hearings in 1957 the City did not seek at that  
24 time to achieve fundamental change in the governmental  
25 arrangements.

26                   We do want to underline this point.  
27 The City's brief did contain an introductory statement  
28 which reiterated quite clearly its favourable attitude  
29 to amalgamation and this was put in consciously to  
30 make it plain to those who would look at the story that







1 Toronto had not turned its back on the form of  
2 government which it had been seeking. Truly, as  
3 the Mayor said this morning, the City of Toronto has  
4 been an advocate of amalgamation since 1950. It has  
5 been on record and this is part of the position.

6 Now on pages 4 and 5 you see an  
7 outline of the procedures which were followed in  
8 preparing and clearing the submission. We put these  
9 in because we feel the amount of weight which should  
10 be attached to any brief is determined in part by the  
11 extent to which it carries the backing of the supposed  
12 sponsor.

13 We suggest to you that the brief does  
14 carry the City's backing. It is prepared by a  
15 consultant, it is true, but not always are consultant's  
16 reports adopted or adopted in their entirety.

17 In the Toronto scene we have an  
18 instance where one of the municipalities altered its  
19 plans in relation to the use of consultant help.

20 The project was carried through over  
21 an extended period of time. Two senior officials  
22 of the City were involved in the undertaking. At every  
23 stage the successive Mayors of Toronto have taken a  
24 personal and continued interest in the undertaking and  
25 the Board of Control and the Council have reviewed and  
26 passed judgment upon the submission in draft form. The  
27 Council had a full two weeks in which to read the  
28 submission before expressing an opinion with respect to  
29 it; all members of Council had been interviewed prior  
30 to the preparation of the submission. We are trying to





1 suggest to you we think that the process has been a  
2 properly responsible and thorough development of a  
3 stand to be taken by the City of Toronto in a matter of  
4 this importance.

5                 Now some people have talked about the  
6 size of the brief, its length, the great amount of  
7 detail and obvious amount of expense in preparing and  
8 producing copies of this document. We did this, not  
9 through any desire to take away from the role which  
10 you yourself are called upon to play as a sole Royal  
11 Commissioner. We did so because we feel a responsibility  
12 as the largest municipality in the area to place in  
13 your hands everything possible to facilitate your  
14 very complete consideration of this problem. We  
15 couple with the written brief and verbal submission  
16 a firm offer to assist in any way we possibly can.

17                 Now the next chapter deals with the  
18 City's view of the problem. I don't propose to read  
19 it at length.

20                 THE COMMISSIONER: We won't let you,  
21 Mr. Hardy. I have read it twice.

22                 MR. HARDY: Fine. I would like to  
23 refer to the speech Mr. Gardiner made to the Canadian  
24 Club in 1960. We think it has a bearing because we  
25 think the terms of reference were thoroughly adequate.  
26 We have felt all along what Mr. Gardiner put so aptly:  
27 "All the synthetic and artificial boundaries to the  
28 contrary, every metropolitan area is one geographic,  
29 one economic and one social unit; and whether we like  
30 it or not it will have to be dealt with on that basis."





1 THE COMMISSIONER: What about the  
2 sentence just before that: "The joining together of  
3 the area municipalities for certain limited purposes  
4 as components of an over-riding metropolitan municipality  
5 cannot be expected to eliminate the jockeying for  
6 advantage in those fields where the area municipalities  
7 remain supreme. The resemblance to the difficult  
8 relationship between Canada and its Provinces is all  
9 too obvious."

10 Would you suggest a unitary government  
11 for Canada?

12 MR. HARDY: No, sir. I suggest the  
13 reasons which dictated the adoption and maintenance of  
14 the federal form of government for our country are  
15 not duplicated in this comparatively very small area.  
16 I think I might read a sentence to you which seems to  
17 me is pertinent to your question. It is on page 80.  
18 We have had here a very great interest in what has  
19 been happening across the line in the United States.  
20 We work with that country so closely in conventions  
21 of organizations like the National Municipal League  
22 and the Governmental Research Association and a whole  
23 variety of bodies, the Municipal Water Work Association,  
24 and the like. We tend to think of ourselves as a kind  
25 of common area for the consideration of problems. They  
26 have been very interested in what has been going on in  
27 Toronto and they have been, in the opinion of some and  
28 I think this is probably true, they have been envious of  
29 what we have been able to do. I would read you from  
30 this article by Banfield and Grodzins:







1 "Deep and persistent political  
2 conflicts divide the population of most metropolitan  
3 areas. Conflict between the central city and the  
4 suburban ring -- which also is a conflict between  
5 lower-classes and middle-classes and between Negroes and  
6 Whites -- in most places rules out any immediate  
7 possibility of 'one local government for one local area'."

8 They are talking about metropolitan  
9 areas in the United States and conflict between the  
10 central city and the suburban ring, which also is  
11 conflict between lower classes and middle classes and  
12 between Negroes and Whites.

13 Now I suggest to you, Mr. Commissioner,  
14 that you are looking at a metropolis which is not  
15 strife torn in this way and which has not this kind  
16 of animosity running through it. I suggest to you  
17 despite the adverse position taken by the contending  
18 parties appearing before you that there is actually  
19 the best of good will among our people and that the  
20 extent of conflict in Metro as it operates today is,  
21 we suggest, inspired by the form of Council.

22 To some extent the pitting of the  
23 City against the suburbs is built right into the form  
24 of Council and the form of School Board and so on. You  
25 get an adversary process introduced into the Council  
26 debates which need not be there in our opinion.

27 Now we suggest to you therefore that  
28 the comparison with the Canadian Federation, to which  
29 we refer on page 8, while it is one that was made by the  
30 Municipal Board and it has been made repeatedly, we think





1 it is not an apt comparison except to describe the  
2 structure. Insofar as the sociological and political  
3 situation is concerned, the economic differences,  
4 there is no comparison. There is no close comparison.  
5 The contrasts are much greater than the likenesses,  
6 as we see it.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: In the paragraph  
8 following the quotation from Mr. Gardiner you say,  
9 talking of the City of Toronto: "With no opportunity  
10 for physical expansion, the core area must wage a  
11 constant battle against a threatened deterioration of  
12 land use."

13 Would not that deterioration continue  
14 anyway even if you stopped suburban growth?

15 MR. HARDY: Well, it would seem to me,  
16 Mr. Commissioner, that is a matter of degree. This, I  
17 would say, is a well recognized problem of all  
18 metropolitan areas, the problem of the central city.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: They have the  
20 problem of redevelopment whether they are metropolitan  
21 corporations or just local governments.

22 MR. HARDY: Quite so. It does seem to  
23 me the rules of the game, if I can put it that way, the  
24 terms of reference under which they face the problems  
25 greatly affect their ability to make an impact on those  
26 problems, even if they are deep seated ones. I suggest  
27 that the Toronto area as one metropolis would identify  
28 and take constructive action more easily and more fully  
29 with respect to these problems of urban renewal as a  
30 single corporate entity than as a federation where it is







1 bound to seem to the suburban members of this community,  
2 or of this group of municipalities, that financial  
3 resources are being drained off for somebody else's  
4 benefit. The long term benefit to themselves is not  
5 nearly so apparent, it seems to me, when these artificial  
6 boundaries focus their attention on the requirements  
7 of the metropolitan area in its parts rather than in a  
8 whole.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: You are saying that  
10 the City of Toronto is being drained for the benefit of  
11 the suburbs. Is that correct?

12 MR. HARDY: Well, this is the position  
13 taken in the brief that the City of Toronto is being  
14 asked to carry an undue share of the cost of government  
15 in this area and there is undue weight of emphasis on  
16 expenditures upon outward expansion.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you then saying  
18 under amalgamation the City would deliberately restrict  
19 the growth of services in the new outer wards?

20 MR. HARDY: We think in a community, as  
21 I see it, Mr. Commissioner, which is a planned community,  
22 we have forms of restriction all the time. That is you  
23 either restrict or facilitate according to how much  
24 money you make available to trunk sewers, expansion of  
25 water pumping supplies, development of roads, and the  
26 like. I am not suggesting that the amalgamated  
27 municipality would follow a policy which would deny  
28 the dictates of growth.

29 I refer you to a sentence on page 14,  
30 the bottom paragraph, the first sentence: "If amalga-





1 mation had gone through, the development of the outer  
2 areas could have been more closely controlled by  
3 staging." This was interpreted in a newspaper article  
4 as suggesting houses which now exist might not have  
5 been built under such a policy. My contention is, and  
6 the intention of the sentence is that houses might  
7 have been built in a different location in terms of the  
8 time at which the urban residential expansion progressed.  
9 They would have been built. We think it would have been  
10 possible to have economized on the expansion of services  
11 to get the tax return more fully from each expansion of  
12 services before you move on to a subsequent area for  
13 development.

14 We also do not suggest that a  
15 metropolis like this can confine its development to  
16 one tiny corner at one time. We do suggest when you  
17 have two great Townships competing for a share of  
18 capital works, development funds, there is a tendency  
19 to proceed concurrently with developments which cause  
20 a greater amount of urban sprawl than would otherwise  
21 apply, and that this is not beneficial in terms of the  
22 cost of development to the metropolitan area.

23 Now, Mr. Commissioner, the next chapter  
24 goes into this whole position of the City's place in  
25 the metropolitan community. I do not propose to spend  
26 much time on it, but I do think it is very important.  
27 The City does feel that by the institution of Metro it  
28 has actually been frozen in a position which is not  
29 tenable in the long term. That is, as a corporate entity  
30 it becomes involved in a large and continuing price for







1 development of the outer areas, only areas where  
2 substantial development at relatively low cost is  
3 possible, and it becomes involved in paying what may  
4 be more than its share of the urban renewal costs in  
5 the inner area.

6 We do believe that while a shift of  
7 industry from central city to suburbs is natural and  
8 to be expected, there is a greater degree of shift  
9 taking place than ought to be the case; that if there  
10 were more forthright and constructive action on  
11 renewal housing in the downtown area, there would be  
12 some reduction in the rate of housing in the outer  
13 areas and the people would be housed to the community's  
14 satisfaction.

15 We are suggesting that Toronto is  
16 certainly not in an equal position with the other  
17 municipalities. It is this relationship of "inner-  
18 outer" which at one stage of growth may favour the  
19 central city and at another stage may favour the  
20 suburban areas. Our contention is that the two  
21 areas, the two types of areas should be tied in and  
22 working together so that the resources of the whole  
23 area are channeled where they are needed. If more are  
24 needed in the inner area at one stage of the metro-  
25 politan growth, fine, and at another stage if a greater  
26 proportion is shifted to the other area, that is also  
27 fine, but this kind of decision can be made as a single  
28 entity where, as a federation, Toronto is actually locked  
29 into, we think, an uneven competitive struggle with the  
30 outer suburban areas.







1 We acknowledge on page 15 a point  
2 I think that is important: "Probably the question of  
3 water rates affords the best example of the competitive  
4 relationship of area municipalities and the impossibility  
5 of avoiding a partisan attitude on some issues."  
6 We are not saying, therefore, with respect to water  
7 rates which we go into at length that the Municipal  
8 Board was wrong in proposing a straight policy of  
9 "let bygones be bygones and we will dump all the capital  
10 assets into the one pot."

11 We are not saying the Province was  
12 right in reversing the Municipal Board's stand and  
13 saying: "No, we will permit preferential water rates  
14 in relation to not the territorial cost of getting the  
15 water to my tap or yours, but in relation to the  
16 accumulation of capital assets which two municipalities  
17 in particular had built up; the City of Toronto and  
18 the Town of New Toronto."

19 We say in the brief here, in effect,  
20 regardless of the rights or wrongs of it, while we are  
21 as a city locked into this division which frustrates  
22 our growth ambitions because it is channeled through  
23 the other municipalities at the expense of the  
24 necessary renewal of the township areas, in what seems  
25 to us to be an unfair financial apportionment of costs.  
26 While this situation exists, how can we be expected to  
27 be glad to throw the capital assets of the City of  
28 Toronto into the metropolitan pool without reserve?  
29 We cannot feel pleased to do this when the resulting  
30 situation is hedged about with conditions which we find





1 unfavourable to the City.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I am just wondering  
3 about the results of these unfavourable conditions.  
4 At the top of page 14 of your brief under the heading  
5 "Locked In", you say, "Ten years ago the creation  
6 of Metro locked the City of Toronto inside its  
7 existing boundaries with no opportunity to expand ..."  
8 and so on. "In the interval the City's taxable  
9 capacity has been surprisingly well maintained. On  
10 a per capita basis, the taxable assessment of Metropolitan  
11 Toronto increased by 22% between 1954 and 1962 whereas  
12 for the City of Toronto the increase was 30%." It  
13 does not suggest very serious restraints on growth.

14 MR. HARDY: I think there is an  
15 explanation for this, Mr. Commissioner. I was well  
16 aware of the two percentages that were put in there.  
17 The point is that when you base assessment on per capita,  
18 when you measure assessment in per capita terms, you  
19 are using a yardstick which does not reflect everything  
20 that is going on. Toronto as a core city is losing  
21 population. If it gets no additional assessment its  
22 per capita assessment strength increases by the mere  
23 loss of population. Do I make myself clear?

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that not a fact  
25 wherever there is a core city and suburban areas?

26 MR. HARDY: Oh, yes, but I say that  
27 this is happening in Toronto like other core cities;  
28 that one expects an increase per capita because of the  
29 so-called flight to the suburbs; the drain of  
30 population, not all of which is destructive -- some of







1 it is unhealthy and some of it is healthy -- but you  
2 get this flight of population to the suburbs. Even  
3 if you get no new development, the very flight of  
4 population gives you an increased assessment per capita.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: But the reduction in  
6 population was not very great.

7 MR. HARDY: This is so. This is so.  
8 Increase has been considerable.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: In assessment?

10 MR. HARDY: In assessment, yes, and  
11 what Toronto is saying, in effect, is this: The  
12 position in which it finds itself requires steadily  
13 more effort to achieve the renewal of land uses which  
14 has been taking place and which in some ways, as we  
15 acknowledge, has been supported by things with a  
16 metropolitan connotation to them -- the Gardiner  
17 Expressway is the best example -- but some of which  
18 has been supported by development that preceded Metro.  
19 I think the best example is the Yonge Street subway  
20 which is not a product of Metro; it is the product of  
21 very genuine City efforts.

22 We are quite prepared to recognize that  
23 the City is not in trouble, but we say that the level  
24 of taxation upon its residential property holders is  
25 very high under this situation, and while it is maintaining  
26 a capacity, it is not maintaining a sufficient capacity  
27 under the apportionment of revenues and expenditures  
28 which takes place today to prevent its residential  
29 taxpayer with the lowest value of property being  
30 subjected to the highest mill rate. This is not a healthy





1 situation as I see it, and this is something which  
2 should not apply in the long term. This is a price, as  
3 we see it, of the Metropolitan development.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it not also  
5 a price of greater density of population in the City  
6 and the requirements for more and more services and  
7 more diversified services?

8 MR. HARDY: Well, our method of  
9 adjusting to that in ordinary municipalities is not  
10 differential mill rates except where you get out to  
11 the outer areas which are not fully urbanized, and  
12 in the comparisons I am making we are not taking those  
13 into account; we are not dealing with those differentials.  
14 We are talking of fully service figure for Scarboro  
15 and fully service figure for North York, Etobicoke, and  
16 relating them to Toronto.

17 Our contention is the situation one  
18 ought to find is this: First, the assessment of  
19 properties will vary according to the location of the  
20 land, the amenities available to the land as well as  
21 to the extent and quality of the dwelling or the  
22 structure on the land, whatever it may be, and  
23 with the uniform mill rate applied against it is the  
24 way we expect in growing communities what we call  
25 the desirable heart areas of an urban city to carry a  
26 greater share of taxes because they demand certain added  
27 services.

28 In local government, as I understand it, we  
29 have no belief in the straight quid pro quo of service  
30 for tax; the property tax is not regarded as an ability





1 to pay form of tax, and it is not regarded as a fee for  
2 services rendered, or anything of this sort.

3 Therefore, as I see it, when you get  
4 differential mill rates, and as the extreme, of Leaside  
5 to Toronto or to Scarborough - we don't need to take  
6 Toronto's case to make the point - these differential  
7 mill rates are inequitable in our opinion because the  
8 appropriate amount of services ought to be made available  
9 to each area within a uniform rate of taxation for  
10 these services which are financed from general taxation.  
11 Then you have in addition, of course, some use of local  
12 improvements.

13 I might add one word on that, and that is  
14 in the Toronto area there has been a very great use  
15 of local improvements.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Not in the City of  
17 Toronto?

18 MR. HARDY: In the City of Toronto.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Is there?

20 MR. HARDY: Yes.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I did not know that.

22 MR. HARDY: You see the attitude which  
23 the City has taken, as I understand it, if a street is  
24 paved once under local improvement, it is unfair to  
25 renew the pavement under local improvement. Local levy  
26 is used to get the services there to begin with. In  
27 the suburban areas this is the way it has been operating.  
28 You get the services there; you pave your street in the  
29 first instance, lay your sidewalk, and you don't repair  
30 your sidewalk out of local improvement.







1 Toronto is old enough that the bulk of its  
2 local improvements are history. There are some in  
3 the accounts - I don't know how large they bulk -  
4 but they are there. Toronto has followed a local  
5 improvement practice. Where the change has occurred  
6 in the outer suburbs now, you have costs met outside  
7 of this pattern altogether under developer agreements,  
8 and this is the new pattern in places other than Toronto.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I notice in  
2 discussing city-suburban competition that you make  
3 reference to the International Airport as a business  
4 focus of great and growing significance. You did not  
5 really want it to be built at the corner of Bay and  
6 King, did you?

7 MR. HARDY: Oh, no. Absolutely not.  
8 We recognize full well, and I hope this comes through  
9 in this presentation, we recognize full well that you  
10 want shopping centres out in the outer areas. Yorkdale  
11 is a good development in my opinion, a thoroughly good  
12 development. Toronto is not critical of that or of  
13 the fact that an airport is normally located in the  
14 outer area whereas a port is normally located in an  
15 inner area. But we think they are all part of the one  
16 piece.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You realize,  
18 Mr. Hardy, it is only because you presented me with such  
19 a thorough brief that I am in a position to ask all  
20 these questions. It is your own fault.

21 MR. HARDY: I am very delighted that  
22 you are asking, Mr. Commissioner; our whole purpose is  
23 to deal as fully with the subject as we are in a position  
24 to do. I am just delighted.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead.

26 MR. HARDY: I would like to say just a  
27 word about this chapter "The Attainments of Metro."  
28 Some years ago the City of Des Moines, which had been  
29 held up as a model city following the Commission Plan  
30 of Government in the United States some years ago adopted the







1 Council Managing Plan. After a couple of years under  
2 the plan I had the opportunity of asking their  
3 Assessment Commissioner how the new plan was working.  
4 He told me it was going very well, but he said it  
5 still does not prove that the Council Manager Plan  
6 is a better arrangement. He said any form of change  
7 creates public interest and excitement and is likely  
8 to stimulate an immediate improvement in government.

9 We think that part of the attainments  
10 of the metropolitan form of government have this  
11 origin, that here was something new, here was something  
12 different, here was something, I say, unfortunately  
13 unusual, and it attracted public interest and therefore  
14 it had its successes. Now, there were other reasons  
15 for its success, and one I want to refer to briefly, is  
16 the position of the Province.

17 On the 25th of February, 1953 Mr.  
18 Frost introduced concurrently into the House two Bills.  
19 One was the Act of Federation and the other was the  
20 Unconditional Grants Act. He spoke in the House of the  
21 "benefits to the Toronto area" of these pieces of  
22 legislation, and he said that among the financial  
23 benefits there would be the payment by the Province of  
24 the expenses of the Greater Toronto Assessment Board  
25 until the end of December, 1953, the expenses of the  
26 Metropolitan Council during this organizational period,  
27 and the salary of the Metro Chairman to January, 1955;  
28 that Metropolitan roads would receive a 50% grant  
29 support instead of 33-1/3%. In other words, you would  
30 get a \$2.00 grant for a \$1.00 local expenditure -- I am





1 sorry, you would get \$1.00 grant for \$1.00 local  
2 expenditure where it had been \$2.00 local expenditure  
3 for \$1.00 grant before. It mentioned also the take-over  
4 at the Markham Road, and as a matter of fact since then  
5 they have taken over stretches of road -- they have  
6 taken over the whole of Yonge Street's Hog's Hollow  
7 and paid the cost of this from the Province. No part of  
8 the cost was thrown on the Toronto area although it  
9 has been Metro; well within Metro.

10 At the same time, and this is more  
11 significant I think, Mr. Frost issued a mimeographed  
12 statement outside of the House which was headed "Some  
13 Direct Financial Benefits to the Toronto Area for  
14 Amalgamation", and he listed these things I have  
15 mentioned and calculated the amount of the financial  
16 benefit, and he listed and calculated the amount of  
17 financial benefit of the unconditional per capita  
18 grants, and he dealt with the benefit of the special  
19 position of school grants. Five items coupled in this  
20 statement which indicates the attitude the Province  
21 actually took financially to this change.

22 The other factor which no one can deny  
23 and which I cannot describe adequately really is the  
24 role that the particular first Metropolitan Chairman  
25 happened to play. Mr. Gardiner in his job as Chairman  
26 was, as I see it, a man of infinite patience, compelling  
27 logic and debate. He had an absolutely uncanny sense  
28 of timing. He had a calculated bluntness at times  
29 and an Irish sentimentality and the combination of it all  
30 meant that he forced the City and suburbs to cooperate in







1 a way in which I think other people could not have done,  
2 by the mere power of the man's personality and brain-  
3 power.

4 Of course, what Mr. Gardiner was  
5 doing was working in areas of complete merger. That  
6 is where his great successes were -- the operation under  
7 one municipality for the whole metropolitan area of  
8 particular services. This is the explanation as we  
9 see it of Metro's success and it is actually, as we  
10 see it, one of the best arguments of going the further  
11 distance to a full amalgamation, a full-fledged merger.

12 I want to skip along more quickly  
13 through the limitations inherent in the Metropolitan  
14 Federation.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: May I just take  
16 you back for one moment? I had a question to put to  
17 you. On page 17 you talk of water charges. You said:  
18 "The progressively higher Metro charges have arisen  
19 essentially from severely greater debt charges incurred  
20 in expanding the supply of water to some suburban areas.  
21 Had Metro not been formed these costs would have fallen  
22 upon the suburban municipalities in question." Where  
23 would they have fallen if there had been amalgamation?

24 MR. HARDY: They would have fallen upon  
25 the total area, where they should. In that event,  
26 however, the apportionment of every cost which has been...  
27 Toronto's objection to this is that having built up a  
28 rather surprising amount of physical assets in its water  
29 plant -- the John Street Pumping Station, I think, is  
30 a good illustration. This was built years ahead of its







1 time to carry water across the south end of the City  
2 and to be in a position of having a proper network  
3 to pump northwards through this whole area. This was  
4 in anticipation really of boundary extensions. Then  
5 by the City's own policy -- and one cannot condone it --  
6 the boundary extensions did not develop; but Toronto  
7 did have this plant.

8 I quite agree and the City is not  
9 contesting it that the fair way to apportion that  
10 suburban cost is over the whole area.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Quite. Were you  
12 going to skip the chapter on the limitations inherent  
13 in Metropolitan Federation?

14 MR. HARDY: No, but I was going to  
15 deal with it quite briefly, if I may.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: I was just going to  
17 refer to the first paragraph where you talk of  
18 acrimonious debates, recounting claims and counter claims  
19 levelling charges of gross inefficiency and so on.  
20 You are not suggesting, are you, that that is confined  
21 only to Metropolitan Councils?

22 MR. HARDY: No. I think what we are  
23 concerned with is the extreme.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: All right; go ahead.

25 MR. HARDY: On the following page we  
26 say under item 2: "One objective which was generally  
27 accepted in the early days of Metro was that duplication  
28 in the performance of municipal actions should insofar  
29 as possible be avoided."

30 This is an illustration of something





1 that we feel and we want to make sure we get across to  
2 you, Mr. Commissioner. That is, that Toronto does  
3 not want to be contentious in this brief. We could  
4 have dealt at very considerable length with that  
5 point.

6                   The high hopes that were held for  
7 Metro buying services from Toronto and making joint  
8 arrangements with Toronto and the various suburbs  
9 which would avoid duplication, and then the gradual  
10 reversal of the position, or Metro with its own growing  
11 strength began replacing cooperative arrangements with  
12 independent arrangements and this kind of thing; we  
13 think is not healthy. We want you to beware of it  
14 but we do not want to be contentious in the brief. That  
15 is why we have not stressed it more than we have.

16                   THE COMMISSIONER: What you are  
17 suggesting is greater centralization of operations. I  
18 have been told that at a certain point centralization  
19 of operations reduces the need for overhead controls  
20 of such magnitude that the costs do not decrease but  
21 increase. What would you say to that?

22                   MR. HARDY: I would say first of all  
23 that unification and centralization are not necessarily  
24 synonymous concepts. Toronto is in favour of unification  
25 but not of undue centralization.

26                   I will give you an illustration which  
27 in effect gives substance to the point that you have  
28 been making. In the organization of the Health Depart-  
29 ment there is at the present time a districting of  
30 the Department -- a number of District Officers under







1 Assistant Medical Officers of Health. I think that is  
2 who is in charge, but anyway there are a number of  
3 Districts.

4 It would seem in the event of a  
5 complete merger that you would reach the stage where  
6 you would need in the administrative sense a double-  
7 decking of your system -- that is, something like the  
8 form of Council we are proposing. You might have  
9 six Districts, four smaller Divisions within each (or  
10 however you word it), and you might have a man of a  
11 certain competence in charge of the Division and a  
12 more senior person in charge of the District.

13 Then the six District people would have  
14 to get together with the Medical Officer of Health to  
15 give you your pyramided structure in your successful  
16 organization.

17 This imposes on the one hand extra  
18 costs. On the other hand it brings certain reductions  
19 in costs. We have taken the position, which I think is  
20 a reasonable one, that there has not been sufficient  
21 study, and we quote Luther Gulick on this point as  
22 dealing with public administration on this continent,  
23 that in this whole problem we should establish an upward  
24 trend in terms of value for the dollar expended.

25 We say that you achieve certain  
26 economies. For example, Dr. Boyd, the Medical Officer  
27 of Health, tells me that the City of Toronto keeps a  
28 punched card record of the health problems of the people  
29 which can be run through and analyzed in relation to  
30 particular contagious diseases which are abroad, or





1 whatever their problems may be. They know the dimensions  
2 of health problems and how to attack them because of  
3 their record system.

4                   The expansion of this record system  
5 to an enlarged area would not add proportionately to  
6 the cost. It would add less than proportionately to  
7 the cost.

8                   Now if you chose not to have this  
9 kind of record system -- which the small municipality  
10 is incapable of having actually -- then you would say  
11 that the merger is adding to the cost, but if you  
12 see as I see a worth in this benefit of modern  
13 administration to the wellbeing of the community, then  
14 you say that in terms of value for the dollars expended  
15 this is a balancing factor to the necessity for some  
16 additional supervision in the structuring of your  
17 Districts and Divisions.

18                   We come very naturally then to the  
19 point we make on page 26, which I think has great  
20 importance -- the two-level system prevents the  
21 development of administrative strength in depth. We  
22 suggest that by dividing up an area into small pieces  
23 you cannot afford to hire certain professional people  
24 at all and you cannot provide for the people the work  
25 opportunities that you obtain in a larger structure.  
26 The large department of the City will have two or three  
27 quite senior people capable of taking charge of the  
28 Department, and it is a big and complex operation. A  
29 smaller place will not have this degree of concentration.  
30 You would get the cross-fertilization, the enrichment and







1 the like from your administration when you break it  
2 into parts.

3                   Take as an example personnel. In the  
4 Toronto area there are a number of municipalities which  
5 fulfill their personnel responsibilities through a  
6 central personnel officer. If in fact the whole  
7 personnel function were brought together you would  
8 have a group of highly competent people who could  
9 reinforce each other's judgment and abilities and  
10 produce results with respect to personnel policies  
11 which I think would be obviously superior.

12                   I think we have to emphasize a  
13 little bit, even without wanting to be destructive  
14 in our brief, the differences between the very large  
15 and the very small municipality.

16                   On page 27 we speak of the health  
17 services. We speak of the work done at Seaton House  
18 for homeless men and for employable unemployed, the  
19 accommodation totalling 350 people.

20                   Regardless of your governmental  
21 boundaries the place for that institution for men is  
22 in the central downtown area. This is the very fabric  
23 of the welfare service which the City of Toronto has  
24 been providing.

25                   We had it suggested in the hearings  
26 that one suburban municipality would have virtually no  
27 use for such an institution. I appreciate this, but  
28 the community to which they belong cannot function without  
29 it. Indeed, it is a magnet drawing the homeless men,  
30 this Metropolitan area, by its very size and success. It







1 draws more than its share of homeless men to the area.  
2 They gravitate to the central city and impose not  
3 only a welfare cost but they impose other related  
4 costs -- certain health costs and so on. This is  
5 something which has to be done in the centre that  
6 ought to be shared by all.

7 I was a little surprised that the  
8 head of one of the municipalities appearing before  
9 you did not seem to know that the operational  
10 responsibility for this service still rests with the  
11 area municipalities and there is only a pooling of  
12 the statutory financial responsibility. It seems  
13 to me this is an indication of how far a person  
14 active in public life can be removed from what is  
15 the real life blood of the Toronto area -- its real  
16 problems which require attention and require constant  
17 attention day by day.

18 I think, Mr. Commissioner, if you were  
19 to visit Seaton House this whole point would be etched  
20 very strongly in your mind. It is a remarkable place,  
21 modern in every respect and well run. Records are  
22 kept properly; money is paid out properly; people  
23 are fed well; it is well done. The people are screened  
24 as to their requirements.

25 We make another point, which I will  
26 just read, because I think it is to do with the role  
27 of representatives that we get into. It is a very  
28 complex role under a two-level system, but we say  
29 on page 30 at the end of that section: "Thus the  
30 public's bewilderment as to the location of responsibility





1 makes extra work for elected representatives and may  
2 lead them to be blamed for shortcomings in areas outside  
3 their own direct jurisdiction."

4 Another thing that has come home to me  
5 in the course of looking at this problem which is  
6 related to that is the fact that there is a very fuzzy,  
7 let us say, concept of what is the role of the elected  
8 representatives. I think actually it could be contended  
9 that the role which elected representatives sometimes  
10 cast for themselves as amateur trouble-shooters does  
11 not make for good government.

12 The elected representative should  
13 build up a professional staff which can deal with the  
14 trouble which arises nine times out of ten, or more --  
15 ninety-nine times out of one hundred. But we do not  
16 see in the City as the first responsibility of the  
17 elected representative to undertake the work of the  
18 Departments and we do not think this applies any more  
19 to a place which is small, like Swansea, than to a  
20 place which is big, like the City of Toronto. We are  
21 living in a big metropolitan area where we have the  
22 opportunity to have the requirements of our people met  
23 properly and professionally, and this we think is very  
24 important in this whole problem.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You have one heading  
26 here at page 29 -- "The Atmosphere at Metropolitan  
27 Meetings is Highly Competitive."

28 Would you say that under an amalgamated  
29 system with some aldermen representing wards in the care  
30 of the City and others representing the suburbs that all







1 would necessarily be peace and harmony?

2 MR. HARDY: No, I do not, Mr.

3 Commissioner. I am cognizant of the position which  
4 ward representatives may and at times do take in  
5 Council deliberations.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You and I have had  
7 occasion to discuss that elsewhere too.

8 MR. HARDY: That is correct. It seems  
9 to me -- and this anticipates something that I wanted  
10 to talk about; I may as well come to it now -- it seems  
11 to me that the problem you have raised is a real one  
12 to which considerable attention might be given, and  
13 we would certainly welcome as much attention to that  
14 problem as you find appropriate.

15 On page 90 we put forward a suggested  
16 form of organization and this form of organization calls  
17 for one plan of representation, which is in line with  
18 the experience in the Toronto area, and which we think  
19 would produce a workable form of Council in handling  
20 its deliberations. It is by no means the only form  
21 and it may not be the best form. This is a subject of  
22 very keen interest to myself and where I took it my  
23 obligation was to include in the brief a form of  
24 organization which was practical and readily saleable  
25 to this area and which was, broadly speaking,  
26 constructive. I have some doubt in my mind as to  
27 whether it is the best we can do.

28 Now we can move in the direction of  
29 the English and have wards which are so small that the  
30 log rolling tactics of ward representatives would be





1 completely unproductive. In a Council like Manchester  
2 or Birmingham one has a Council of around 150 members.  
3 That is ward representatives aside from the aldermen.  
4 It seems to me it is pretty hard for them to be very  
5 aggressive on behalf of a section when they represent  
6 such a small area.

7                    You have an alternative like Detroit  
8 where there is a city population larger than Toronto  
9 would become and your Council is a Council of ten men,  
10 all elected at large by general vote. I think that  
11 this kind of choice between those extremes is  
12 something of very, very great importance, very great  
13 importance to this Toronto area.

14 In the previous hearings a couple of  
15 people questioned whether the Board of Control Executive  
16 Committee approach, and the Executive Committee they  
17 speak about is really a Board of Control by another  
18 name, whether this was the most constructive and most  
19 salutary approach to the Council structure and the  
20 electoral pattern. I think this kind of question needs  
21 to be examined but we suggest, and we have emphasized  
22 it, we have said the City - suburban competition is  
23 the keystone of Metro. We suggest the structure should  
24 not foment division. The structure should encourage the  
25 adoption of the area-wide point of view as the viewpoint  
26 of over-riding importance but yet enable people to  
27 identify and take account of neighbourhood interests.  
28 This calls for a neat balancing of forces, it seems to  
29 me. It is one where we welcome the experience and the  
30 judgment you can bring to bear on the problem.







Hardy

1 THE COMMISSIONER: I will say this,  
2 your premise, your suggestion merits very serious  
3 consideration having regard to the background of Toronto  
4 and its experience and traditions of American government.

5 MR. HARDY: I would say something  
6 personally. This is not said on behalf of the City.  
7 I just interject this one note. I think the powers of  
8 the Executive Committee or the Board of Control, the  
9 role of such a body and the voting strength, its  
10 relationship to standing committees, always warrants  
11 re-examination.

12 Now, Mr. Commissioner, as to the problem  
13 of unequal representation: I first note that East York  
14 has included in its brief the statement that small  
15 units can develop into undemocratic boroughs unless  
16 all representation is based on a small population. In  
17 other words, the municipality which is the borderline  
18 between the small and the large is prepared to  
19 recognize this problem.

20 I want to make one other point. I  
21 think it would be unworthy of the Toronto area to seek  
22 and obtain a pattern of representation in which assess-  
23 ment was one of the bases of vote-getting. I think it  
24 would be very unworthy of this area, very out of keeping  
25 with the whole tradition of government through which  
26 we have lived.

27 Then I am prepared to discuss, if you  
28 have questions, the multiple vote scheme. We think it  
29 just didn't make sense. I have looked at what Swansea  
30 is proposing and I cannot work up any enthusiasm for the







1 arrangement of Council.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think, Mr.  
3 Hardy, it is necessary for you to develop anything on  
4 multiple voting.

5 MR. HARDY: Thank you. Now we raised  
6 the problem of the inability to achieve a satisfactory  
7 division of services. We attempt to illustrate this on  
8 pages 34 and 35 by describing some of the things that  
9 could happen with respect to Metropolitan roads and so  
10 on. I must say from my digging into this subject of  
11 jurisdiction I found this section about the hardest  
12 section to write of the whole report because the  
13 position is actually so complex and so difficult for  
14 those to explain it to you. When I got it written I  
15 left out some of the complexity that does in fact apply  
16 in this statement but it seemed to us to truly cover  
17 the point.

18 The other thing that is brought out  
19 by a listing of services, the exclusive Metro, the  
20 exclusive local, and the shared functions, is a strong  
21 reminder of the different degrees of sacrifice, if you  
22 will, which was expected of the City as compared to  
23 the suburbs in embarking upon the metropolitan form of  
24 government.

25 You will remember that the suburban  
26 municipalities were already members of the two tier  
27 federation, the southern urban municipalities in the  
28 County of York, and as such certain services were  
29 performed by the County of York for them. They turned  
30 their heads southward and a line was drawn separating them





1 from the County and if you look at that list you will  
2 see of the exclusive Metropolitan functions three of  
3 them are County functions, are other authority functions,  
4 five, six and seven. I think it is fair to say for  
5 those municipalities, had they remained in York they  
6 would have been in this position, they would have  
7 exercised their powers through the County. Under the  
8 shared functions eight of seventeen would have been  
9 County functions as the County of York was operating  
10 then or as evolved today. I say "as evolved today"  
11 because the County of York has taken on a planning  
12 function very directly. They have engaged a consultant  
13 and they have a planning programme which they are  
14 permitted under the Act. Some of these are permissible,  
15 that and their responsibility in the area of parks, but  
16 the remaining six of the eight are things which they  
17 are bound to get into.

18 The degree of the adjustment was  
19 much greater for Toronto. Toronto did divest itself  
20 of things much more than the suburban municipalities.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You list water supply  
22 and distribution and sewage collection and disposal  
23 as shared functions. Do you think there is a distinction  
24 between wholesale supply of water and its distribution?

25 MR. HARDY: Mr. Commissioner, I would  
26 say that any list that you want to set up is to a degree  
27 arbitrary: What is the whole function and what is not?  
28 I have looked at two other lists in developing this  
29 list and I have tried to develop one that is realistic.  
30 I think this is debatable. Similarly, I suppose,







1 you could say Metropolitan roads and local roads is  
2 a separate function. Then there is the matter of degree.  
3 There is how you look at this. I would be inclined to  
4 call these shared functions.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: After all, Toronto  
6 is not the first to distinguish between water supply  
7 and distribution. There is the Greater Winnipeg water  
8 district, Greater Vancouver, Greater Victoria -- going  
9 back many years. It is considered an exclusive function  
10 of the water district and distribution is an exclusive  
11 local function.

12 MR. HARDY: This is certainly a point  
13 of view but I think in line with our experience the  
14 other point of view is valid.

15 On page 38 I want to draw your  
16 attention to something which I hope will be given due  
17 weight in looking at this problem and that is the extent  
18 to which, in this present day, one can develop central  
19 staff functions which have a potential for efficiency  
20 and impartiality and dispatch and so on, which is just  
21 not available when they are handled in any other way.

22 Toronto as a core city has not been  
23 a city without progress. It has not been a city which  
24 is stagnating despite the ties upon it terms of  
25 territorial limits. We do think that Toronto's record  
26 here is outstanding and that this is a strength of  
27 administration which can and should be made available to  
28 all and which would be enhanced further by being  
29 enlarged.

30 Now I don't propose to go through the





1 various services and forgetting the shared functions I  
2 want to say one word with respect to Public Welfare on  
3 page 43. The City of Toronto in its net welfare  
4 expenditures is faced with a greater expenditure in  
5 what remains with it than the amount which was removed  
6 and transferred to Metro by the consolidation of the  
7 statutory general welfare responsibilities.

8 I think it should be made quite plain  
9 that the Province, and I have had this confirmed by  
10 provincial officials and I think you can have it  
11 confirmed by provincial officials, the Province  
12 never conducted those services which are statutorily  
13 eligible for 80% grant support under the general welfare  
14 assistance legislation and constitute all or the bulk  
15 of the welfare programme in its quantity and quality.  
16 The large municipalities ought to be carrying this on,  
17 particularly the greater urban municipalities with  
18 their highly impersonal character, and the greater  
19 extent of problems which arise for people if they have  
20 economic difficulties or social problems and the like.

21 Now, we suggest to you therefore that  
22 while part of the financial burden has been equalized  
23 much more remains unequalized and Toronto, as the core  
24 area, is with respect to remaining welfare responsibilities  
25 carrying an undue share of the load.

26 Now just a word on the Parks and  
27 Recreation. The point that seems to us to come through  
28 here is that municipal boundaries make no sensible  
29 division line for apportioning the responsibilities  
30 for parks and recreation. You have to ask yourself: How





1 will these services be handled? Where are the beaches?  
2 Where are the trees? Where are the concentrations  
3 of population with no boulevards on the streets, the  
4 sidewalks flush against the pavement? Where are the  
5 areas of crowded housing requiring different and more  
6 intensive public recreational programmes?

7 We don't say that Toronto is the  
8 only municipality that may have more than its share of  
9 the responsibility because of the location of these  
10 things, but we do say it is one and we say the only way  
11 to make the apportionment equitable, if this is one  
12 community which we maintain, is to make this whole  
13 function of Parks and Recreation a Metropolitan  
14 function.

15 Now, you have to have the potential  
16 and we have it, not only in Toronto, they have it in  
17 Vancouver. For example, they are talking about their  
18 service out there. We have the potential for recreational  
19 centres serving a population upwards of 50,000.

20 Now how can small municipalities compete  
21 in this sphere and how can you locate centres to which  
22 you draw, like through the spokes of the wheel, to the  
23 centre the people who require the service and how can you  
24 draw them to the centres when you have higglety pigglety  
25 boundaries. We think it is impossible.

26 There is another point that comes up  
27 here. In putting this whole case together every effort  
28 was made to discover services where a local independence  
29 of action and decision making would be constructive. One  
30 that comes to people's minds is a park and recreation







1 programme. This whole subject has been explored  
2 very thoroughly with the Parks and Recreation  
3 Department and I suggest if you have any doubts on the  
4 score, Mr. Commissioner, it would well warrant your  
5 time to talk with our parks people. We would be glad  
6 to make them available at your convenience.

7 I am solidly convinced from my  
8 discussions with them that the amount which can be done  
9 and should be done professionally for an urban  
10 recreation programme, the amount which ought to be done  
11 to mechanize the care of parks and so on, that it just  
12 does not make sense to separate these functions into  
13 two levels with an independent responsibility lodged  
14 at the second level. This is quite a different thing  
15 from districting the services.

16 Now on page 48 there is a reference  
17 to public libraries and the Library Board has produced  
18 its own brief and like the School Board the City of  
19 Toronto has authorized me to consult with these people  
20 and to examine their positions and to seek for  
21 consistency among those presenting briefs on behalf  
22 of the Toronto area.

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1                   There has been a great deal of concern  
2 as to what should happen to libraries in relation to the  
3 Shaw Report. Dr. Shaw in his report on pages 94 and 95  
4 deals with local government, and he gives it little  
5 space, and I suggest to you he has apparently not given  
6 it a thorough study of the sort which you would want to  
7 give this problem. The relationship of the public  
8 library to local government. I think the key to his  
9 position is his final paragraph on page 95 which I will  
10 read if you wish. It is a short one.

11                   "Probably the definitive argument is  
12 the fact that the people of Metropolitan Toronto have  
13 considered the question of further merger of their  
14 communities into the City of Toronto and have decided  
15 instead on the present federated pattern of operation  
16 with a limited number of services that can only be  
17 provided on a Metro-wide basis transferred to Metro and  
18 by other services administrated by the local communities.  
19 There appears to be no reason why this pattern should  
20 not be applied to library services in Metro just as it  
21 has been applied to many other services."

22                   I think Dr. Shaw was unaware of the  
23 extent to which the Metro pattern was in flux, the  
24 extent to which there were problems which were boiling  
25 up as evidenced by the Cumming Committee which studied  
26 this matter in 1957, and we suggest that while big  
27 government such as Toronto, if enlarged, would require  
28 special attention to the organization of the library  
29 function, that it can insofar as its operational  
30 administration is concerned be well handled under such a







1 system, and as far as financial equity is concerned,  
2 much better.

3 Mr. Commissioner, on page 51 we show  
4 the differences in per capita expenditures on public  
5 health. I have already indicated this afternoon  
6 something of the reason for these differences. I refer  
7 you to page 106 at the top of the page where you see  
8 what we suggest are the five major reasons which might  
9 account for differences in an expenditure level, and  
10 suggest to you that if you look at Toronto's health  
11 services you will find no inefficiency is the cause  
12 of high cost.

13 On page 55 we make the point about  
14 electric service which I think ought to be stressed.  
15 That is that it would be unthinkable for private  
16 utilities to be operating in the Toronto area as the  
17 hydro systems are expected to do as a group of separate  
18 independent distributors each looking after a portion  
19 of the Greater Toronto territory.

20 We do not mind districting, but we do  
21 think that completely independent management in bits  
22 and pieces with variological boundaries does not make  
23 sense for the Toronto area.

24 On page 56 we summarize where we feel  
25 that matters stand on this whole problem, and I won't  
26 read it to you now.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: After number ten  
28 you have a paragraph which says: "The progressive  
29 transfer of service responsibilities to the metropolitan  
30 level has had the effect of reducing the scale of certain





1 city operations, eliminating certain positions and  
2 removing some responsibilities from senior officials."

3 I am advised that excluding the  
4 assessment and police departments the personnel of the  
5 City of Toronto has risen from 4,219 in 1953 to 5,161  
6 in 1963. Almost 1,000 increase.

7 MR. HARDY: Quite so.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: As I say, here you  
9 say that the scale of certain operations has declined  
10 and certain positions eliminated. Have you anything  
11 to say about that increase?

12 MR. HARDY: Yes. If you break this  
13 picture down into components, the point that is made  
14 here is quite accurate. That is, if you transfer a  
15 certain function to the Metro level you eliminate  
16 staff performing that function from the Toronto  
17 establishment. Now, if the staff is transferred it  
18 may cause no great problem there, but you do thereby  
19 take away particular responsibility which was being  
20 supervised by someone else.

21 I think the overall increase is off-  
22 setting this problem of draining away people from  
23 particular areas, but our real purpose in introducing  
24 this, is to suggest what would happen if you continue,  
25 service by service, or part service by part service,  
26 the transfer of responsibilities to the Metropolitan  
27 government but left your department heads still sitting  
28 there in the area municipalities. You could quite  
29 well have shrinking functions. The expansion I think  
30 is to be expected in relation to the change in government





1 which has been going on over the period of Metro, I  
2 would presume, and I have not any reason to believe  
3 that there is any padding up of staff in Toronto or  
4 in area municipalities.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: I am not suggesting  
6 that. I am merely pointing to the figures that I have  
7 in relation to your statement about decrease in  
8 population and the reduction in the scale of certain  
9 city operations. I leave it at that. I just draw it  
10 to your attention.

11 MR. HARDY: There is of course one  
12 further point that the City of Toronto has been  
13 performing certain services for Metro and for other  
14 areas. I do not know how important that is in the  
15 scheme of things, but it would seem to me that perhaps  
16 another reason is that there may be a growing recognition  
17 of responsibility in certain areas. I would think  
18 probably the welfare staff is increased and I think it  
19 would be hard to argue that the Welfare Department is  
20 doing more than is needed today.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I am prepared to  
22 adjourn for ten minutes, Mr. Hardy. I am prepared to go  
23 on to five o'clock. Do you think you could finish by  
24 five?

25 MR. HARDY: Yes, I think so. If you  
26 would like me to go faster on any point I would be glad  
27 to.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You just go ahead.  
29 Let us plan on finishing at five. I will adjourn for  
30 ten minutes now. I hate to keep the newspaper men after







1 hours, but they will have to do what we do.

2  
3 ---SHORT ADJOURNMENT.

4 MR. HARDY: Mr. Commissioner, during  
5 the break I did talk with our officials on one point  
6 that was raised, and that was the number of personnel  
7 in the City establishment and its increase over the  
8 years. There are two things I would like to say about  
9 that.

10 First of all, we are quite prepared  
11 to endeavour to get information together for you, if  
12 it will be useful, which will analyze the places where  
13 the increases have taken place and the reasons that seem  
14 to us to lie back of them.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I am having that  
16 looked into, Mr. Hardy.

17 MR. HARDY: Well, certainly you will  
18 get the City's cooperation on that too.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I cannot complain  
20 about the cooperation I have received to date.

21 MR. HARDY: Very good. A further  
22 point is there were a couple of things that did occur  
23 to us that affect this position. You know the problem  
24 I am sure of the merger of the Fire Department because  
25 of the fact they shifted from a 56-hour week to a 42-hour  
26 week ahead of the suburbs. In fact, the suburbs have  
27 not all gotten there yet, but this reduction in work  
28 week automatically increased the fire personnel, and  
29 firemen are a large numerical component of the total  
30 personnel.





1 Another thing that we think of where  
2 increases have occurred is in the safety inspection  
3 undertakings. In the Buildings Department in particular  
4 there have been amendments to provincial legislation  
5 which have placed certain responsibilities on munici-  
6 palities and strengthened others, and this has been  
7 met by staff increases there.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I knew you would  
9 get personal at a certain stage. I am responsible for  
10 some of these increases as a result of a previous  
11 Royal Commission report.

12 MR. HARDY: Well, the City does not  
13 resent this. In fact the reaction I have had in Toronto  
14 and elsewhere is that these were changes which were  
15 very much needed. Municipal people are glad to see it  
16 take effect.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I did not say it by  
18 way of criticism. I just bring your attention to it in  
19 the light of your statements, but I will have all that  
20 information, Mr. Hardy.

21 MR. HARDY: There is just one other  
22 point I will mention in a word: Toronto has developed  
23 a recreation programme in its parks and recreation  
24 centres and arenas which is out of all proportion to  
25 what it used to have ten years ago.

26 On another point, again because we want  
27 to supply you with all the information, we want to  
28 encourage you to obtain information from the City. There  
29 was reference made to the per capita increase within  
30 the City proper earlier. You will recall this?







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

2 MR. HARDY: One factor has been while  
3 Toronto is said to be on 1940 values in the assessment  
4 operation, actually land values have not been maintained  
5 on a sort of constant plane or in a static position.

6 The values in certain areas have been  
7 very greatly increased and values within the City proper  
8 have increased and apparently account for some part  
9 of this change in the per capita position.

10 I would like to underline one more  
11 point on page 58, which is part of Toronto's brief.  
12 It seems to us that attention should be drawn to this.  
13 There has been some prominence attached, some play made  
14 of the fact that Metro has an arrangement, a governmental  
15 arrangement is progressing and part of the progress  
16 it has been said has been to take over certain welfare  
17 and educational costs by the central authority in the  
18 interests of equity. We accept and recognize this as  
19 having that effect insofar as those particular services  
20 are concerned.

21 Whether or not the total financial  
22 operation of Metro is equitable or not, it is a bit  
23 like the Province grant situation to municipalities  
24 with some 80 grants, some of which are graded upwards  
25 as the municipality is larger in size and is urban,  
26 some of which are graded in reverse, some of which are  
27 related to assessment, some to population and so on.  
28 When you add up these 80 types of grants you say to  
29 yourself, is the total result equitable? And it is  
30 very difficult to determine.





1 Metro is in a similar position. So  
2 while we have raised some question about the increased  
3 pooling of educational costs in relation to this  
4 overall total, we are not contesting them as individual  
5 items. But we make another point, a quite different  
6 point, and a very significant one.

7 It seems to us most dangerous indeed  
8 to give municipalities an opportunity to spend money  
9 without any responsibility for the raising of that money.  
10 This has come about in these two areas, aside from the  
11 administrative expense which is involved in what could  
12 get to be the handing out of largess. The  
13 attitude of a municipality to the dispensing of general  
14 public assistance is bound to be influenced by whether  
15 they have to pay any part of that cost. We think it  
16 is quite dangerous to have this division between the  
17 two and we suggest that it is evidence of one of the  
18 problems of Metro of trying to keep a division of  
19 responsibilities, a financial equity, an overriding  
20 financial equity and an overriding sense of responsi-  
21 bility. We think that this is what is being sacrificed  
22 here.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, are you  
24 objecting to provincial grants to municipalities?

25 MR. HARDY: Not at all.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: You are just objecting  
27 to provincial grants to Metro?

28 MR. HARDY: I am objecting to the fact  
29 that in -- let us take welfare. I am not sure I have  
30 made my point. The suburban municipality of X -- let us







1 not attach a title to it -- the suburban municipality  
2 of X today is able to grant general public assistance  
3 knowing that if it keeps its payments within the amount  
4 which is approved for statutory grant purposes, and  
5 statutory grant payments, 80% of the amount will be  
6 paid by the Province and the remaining 20% by the  
7 metropolitan government. I suggest to you that under  
8 these circumstances a municipality which may have been  
9 dragging its feet on welfare payments is encouraged to  
10 compete for a share of the spending.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: I see your point now.  
12 Your point is that there should be at least a certain  
13 minimum that a municipality should raise by itself  
14 and pay?

15 MR. HARDY: For itself to keep a  
16 responsible attitude to the expenditure.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I see your point  
18 there.

19 MR. HARDY: It applies in these two  
20 areas, these two changes which have taken place recently.  
21 It has removed the category of spending entirely from  
22 the shoulders of the local municipality within the rules  
23 of the game -- the statutorially defined limits over  
24 expenditures within what you might call a fairly austere  
25 framework. There is no definite responsibility upon  
26 the local municipality. We think this is wrong.

27 In the brief the basic concept of  
28 finance and planning, the economic imbalance that is  
29 referred to in the Department of Economics' report and  
30 so on is mentioned here. Through the brief in three







1 different sections there is a good deal of attention  
2 given to this subject. This to yourself, I know, is  
3 an old, old -- I do not want to say "chestnut". It is  
4 an important issue. It is an old familiar matter, let  
5 us say, and I think I would be labouring it to discuss  
6 it with you.

7 But I want to underline what we said  
8 with respect to planning in the brief because this  
9 reaction to the situation is by no means an old  
10 chestnut. It is something which might be regarded as  
11 an irresponsible attitude by professionals to have in  
12 the draft official plan of Metro a statement which says:  
13 "It has had to be assumed in preparing this Official  
14 Plan that local assessment ratios will remain a matter  
15 of vital concern to each of the 13 area municipalities,  
16 and this assumption has necessarily been taken into  
17 account in the preparation of the land use plan."

18 That is on page 61. I am sorry; I  
19 did not give you the reference. It is the second half  
20 of the indented quotation under item 8 towards the  
21 third paragraph up.

22 At the time the Metro draft official  
23 plan was first issued the then Director of the planning  
24 operation described this as practical planning. If it  
25 is practical planning I am not sure it ought not to  
26 be called a sell-out to professional planning. I  
27 really feel very strongly on this matter, Mr. Commissioner.  
28 If we are going to have metropolitan planning let us  
29 have it and not a pretense of it. If one makes the tax  
30 position and the land use objectives of the individual





1 municipalities for themselves the overriding vital  
2 concern, this is vital concern and I do not think we  
3 can have proper metropolitan planning.

4                   The exception to that is merely those  
5 public uses of property which do not impinge upon the  
6 private use of land. That is, they can improve the  
7 metropolitan roads and so on, but if they try and say:  
8 "No, we do not want industry there", or "We do not want  
9 a R1 residential here; the need here is for R2 or R3"  
10 -- whatever it might be -- then it seems to me you  
11 are frustrating the whole purpose of overall planning  
12 of land use -- the private use of land; public not  
13 entirely, but on the private use of land it seems to me  
14 it is completely frustrating.

15                   Chapter 6 is a long one and it is  
16 not one which I am going to spend any time on other than  
17 by way of this very general explanation. When the City  
18 of Toronto engaged me as a consultant to prepare this  
19 submission, my terms of reference were sufficiently  
20 broad as to enable me to go over and re-think the  
21 issues in this area, despite an obvious amount of  
22 background from work in the Toronto area which would  
23 have enabled me to put something together almost  
24 immediately.

25                   This material on what has been happening  
26 elsewhere in Canada and in other parts of the world and  
27 the attitudes of people to the problem and so on -- this  
28 material is brought forward here as a sort of synthesis  
29 of some of the literature on the subject which was read  
30 to assure myself that what I was producing made some sense.







1                   The City's terms of reference did  
2 not require that I recommend tentatively -- profession-  
3 ally prepare a draft recommendation for their approval  
4 calling for a complete merger, 100% merger in the area.  
5 Once we were not going to the Municipal Board and my  
6 assignment was not merely to help other people produce  
7 a series of documents which they would present and  
8 give evidence upon, then the assignment was to look  
9 again at the problem and to reassure ourselves as to  
10 what we should say on it.

11                   The idea of boroughs or modifications  
12 of Metro was discussed over and over again. This  
13 chapter is a statement which relates, as I say, to  
14 that. From the work that was done it gave the City  
15 and myself a strengthened conviction that its position  
16 was the correct one, that its basic position was right.

17                   Now we considered the possibility -- for  
18 instance, in English parishes in 1956 there was a change  
19 in legislation which enabled the rural parish to perform  
20 certain autonomous discretionary functions which they  
21 had not previously been undertaking. We said to ourselves:  
22 "Is this a trend which should be looked up and picked  
23 up and fitted into the neighbourhood concept of Toronto's  
24 planning?" The conclusion that we reached was that  
25 anything which gave the people a Balkan independence with  
26 respect to any public service -- a Balkan-type  
27 independence with respect to any public service, was  
28 damaging to the general public good and that anything  
29 which was constructed to differentiate between one  
30 neighbourhood and another could be expressed constructively





1 under a proper relationship between constituents and  
2 representatives and under a proper districting of  
3 services to take those services down into these  
4 intimate areas and to explore with people the differences  
5 that were needed and continued to be needed.

6 In the City's parks and recreation  
7 programme, as an example, the Commissioner believes  
8 he has quite a different responsibility to fulfill in,  
9 let us say, the Moss Park area from his responsibility  
10 in ward 9. In some of the suburban submissions I got  
11 the impression that they felt that once you drew a  
12 municipal boundary and enclosed an area within one  
13 corporate entity everything within that entity had to  
14 be uniform, ground out of a sausage machine absolutely  
15 without variation to allow for differing conditions.

16 It would be quite ridiculous to build  
17 Seaton Houses out around the suburban ring. They do  
18 not belong there. They belong in the downtown part  
19 of Toronto, in the area which has depressed working  
20 conditions at times and where you have the gathering  
21 of the unemployed.

22 Similarly we suggest that in the  
23 school programme or in any other programme the home the  
24 child comes from has a bearing on what he needs in the  
25 public service. It has a bearing on how often you have  
26 to go into the home. For instance, in Regent Park, in  
27 the pre-Regent Park days the public health nurses were  
28 in and out of those homes far more frequently than after  
29 the re-housing urban renewal and they found the children  
30 coming to school with pediculosis (is that the word?);







1 it is trouble up here (indicating) and it causes one  
2 to scratch. And they found all kinds of problems of  
3 petty thievery and so on and a great reduction in  
4 these when the housing conditions changed.

5 Toronto wants to make these services  
6 responsive to the particular conditions of various  
7 areas and it also wants to be in a position to improve  
8 those areas where the area itself is contributing to  
9 excessive service requirements because the conditions  
10 of the area are not as they should be. But we cannot  
11 see building walls around these areas and assigning  
12 fully independent powers to the people concerned.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: In this chapter  
14 on page 68 under the heading "Does Big Government Grow  
15 More Expensive?" you say: "It is quite unreasonable  
16 to suggest that local government is in danger of becoming  
17 unmanageable in any respect if it grows beyond a certain  
18 size."

19 I have been told in one or two briefs  
20 -- and I think you heard them -- that the experience  
21 of the City of Toronto with its Public Works Department  
22 in the last two or three years disproves this statement.  
23 What would you say to that, Mr. Hardy? I know about  
24 the two reports, the one which recommended centralization  
25 and the other de-centralization.

26 MR. HARDY: Quite. I would like to say  
27 something about that and I would like to ask the  
28 question, is the price of big government inefficiency?  
29 And my answer to that is No.

30 As to this undertaking, I well remember







1 the date on which the Wood-Gordon report was brought  
2 in, because I read it while I was waiting in hospital  
3 for my elder son to be born. So it was more than seven  
4 years ago that the report was issued. In the way it  
5 was presented to you the time span was shortened a  
6 bit because it talks about its taking effect five or  
7 four years ago -- I forget which they said. But this  
8 development was planned for seven years ago and then  
9 went through a process of implementation.

10 The Wood-Gordon report was an overall  
11 study of the municipal organization with reference to  
12 its administrative operations as departmental structuring  
13 and it called for a lot of changes. It took the broad  
14 approach of trying to consolidate operations where they  
15 seemed feasible so you could build a pyramid structure  
16 of organization which would be more manageable by the  
17 Board of Control. There were other recommendations  
18 there for this centralization, this being an apex point  
19 into the administration to tie in with the Council.

20 The Works Department measure was part  
21 of this proposal. The implementing people were  
22 Comptroller Brand -- Chairman of the Implementing  
23 Committee first and then Comptroller Brand, and then  
24 Comptroller William Allen, and the present Comptroller  
25 Orliffe was the other member. It took a length of time  
26 to carry forward this programme and to see how it would  
27 work out.

28 The Implementation Committee did not  
29 implement the Wood-Gordon report chapter and verse just  
30 as it was written. It consulted with Wood-Gordon. They





1 modified parts of the plan. This is natural, I think.

2 Ther the Works Department as such was  
3 what I would call a multi-function consolidation.

4 It put some quite different operations in with each  
5 other and if you had started it in a way that someone  
6 in that Department was quite capable of dealing with  
7 this situation this might have been made to work.

8 I do not want to deal heavily in  
9 personalities, but I want to say that here is a  
10 programme of improvement of the structuring of the  
11 City begun over seven years ago being carried through  
12 and watched as it operated and as one had experience  
13 with it.

14 Another thing that has happened since  
15 then is the establishment of what is called a Treasury  
16 Board modelled on the emphasis that we find on this  
17 function in the Government of Canada and in the  
18 Province of Ontario. The Treasury Board is certainly  
19 less than ten years old, I think. I am guessing, Mr.  
20 Commissioner; but it is of long standing.

21  
22  
23 -

24  
25 -

26  
27  
28 -  
29  
30







1                   Now, this body was the body which in  
2 fact reviewed and decided that this multi-function  
3 department might better be split apart, again bearing  
4 in mind the actual staff potential and so on. They  
5 used a consultant to assist them on certain technical  
6 matters and therefore they used a different consultant  
7 because they wanted this consultant to perform a much  
8 more intensive service in a technical area, the area  
9 of engineering. This was no denial of the validity of  
10 the previous consultant's report nor for the programme  
11 of evolving the kind of governmental structure which  
12 had been called for.

13                   There is a further point I would like  
14 to make with respect to this and that is related again  
15 to the point being raised by one of the suburban  
16 municipalities. The City of Toronto would never  
17 contend that bigness is an "automatic value". You  
18 will see in the brief where this is put before you in  
19 writing and I think it might be Leaside. You will see  
20 that they use this expression "automatic value". We  
21 say that bigness does not have automatic value.

22                   I think it is hard to improve upon the  
23 quotation which is Shakespearian in its literary form.  
24 It is a quotation of the late President Kennedy: "The  
25 truth about big government is the truth about any great  
26 activity; it is complex. Certainly it is true that  
27 size brings dangers, but it is also true that size can  
28 also bring benefits." We might add to that "if you  
29 work at it."

30                   Toronto has been working at its





1 departmental structure and organization to achieve the  
2 wider opportunities of bigness and they have decided,  
3 and it seems to me a reasonable decision, to break up  
4 this multi-function operation. This does not mean their  
5 department would be incapable of carrying the volume  
6 represented by amalgamation.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Incidentally, on  
8 the same page you have a quotation from Dr. Luther  
9 Gulick. I agree with you, Dr. Gulick is one of the  
10 great authorities. I think, if you will check, when  
11 he spoke about metropolitan operations he had in mind  
12 a metropolitan form of government. I happen to have  
13 read his most recent book.

14 MR. HARDY: Well, the intention in the  
15 quotation of Dr. Gulick was not to suggest that he  
16 is an advocate of unitary metropolitan government.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: He is not.

18 MR. HARDY: But I think one must bear  
19 in mind something which is very apparent to me from an  
20 association of a limited sort, which goes back close to  
21 twenty years. Dr. Gulick is attempting to interpret  
22 government in the context of the American community and  
23 one thing that has concerned him greatly is the straight-  
24 jacket implications, he has called it, of home rule.  
25 That is his expression there in a speech he made in  
26 Cleveland, or Cincinnati, I couldn't tell you which.  
27 I think that you have to relate what he proposes to this  
28 quite different relationship between local government  
29 and the senior governments.

30 Now I recall the Mayor of St. Louis one







1 time telling me of the campaign they had to change the  
2 City's charter. He was not telling me, it was a  
3 speech to a group of us. He was speaking of a campaign  
4 they had to change the City's charter and how it had  
5 failed because they could not win the vote to do so.  
6 The reason they couldn't was because a suspicion  
7 developed that there was a race issue involved between  
8 Negro and White.

9 Now it would seem to me that the  
10 Metropolitan Federation might be a very genuine step  
11 of progress for some municipalities but we have that  
12 here today in Toronto and I think the step of progress  
13 now is to this further form. We are in advance of the  
14 American communities without exception because we have  
15 reached out territorially by this two-level scheme  
16 of things. I think we are in a position to extend this  
17 process. I have never said that the Metropolitan  
18 government was a retrograde step, nor has the City of  
19 Toronto. The City of Toronto thought you could skip that  
20 step and go to amalgamation and whether or not they  
21 were right in 1950, they now have a doubly strong case  
22 to advocate it today.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: I think you have  
24 pretty much covered the rest of the chapter. You  
25 covered it this morning.

26 MR. HARDY: Yes, I am satisfied I have,  
27 Mr. Commissioner.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You also covered the  
29 next chapter insofar as it deals with the borough system  
30 and the suggested form of organization.







1 MR. HARDY: Yes. I would like to  
2 make one point there, Mr. Commissioner, and that  
3 relates to what is happening in the suburban briefs.  
4 In preparing this brief we dealt with the four or five  
5 city system. We have had a good deal of support for  
6 our attack on it in these varying positions which  
7 have been struck by suburban municipalities. We have  
8 had one municipality say quite bluntly, at least one  
9 and perhaps several say quite bluntly that the financial  
10 problem of Scarborough would not be solved under either  
11 the four or five city system as conceived in the  
12 Economics Department and this seems to be obvious  
13 and I must say a most disappointing document to come out  
14 without making plain the reason it would cost Scarborough  
15 nothing to shift to the four or five city system is  
16 it would improve its position not one whit. This was  
17 the case. This was a mechanical summation of costs  
18 and redistribution. There was nothing to prove a  
19 change for Scarborough because there is no change proposed  
20 for Scarborough from its present position. This is one  
21 thing that I think needs to be emphasized.

22 Another thing is if we look at the  
23 proposals which have come forward we have such a  
24 variety of proposals that it is a little like trying  
25 to nail jelly to the wall to deal with them. They call  
26 for alterations in political boundaries which are  
27 perhaps described in vague terms, perhaps not defined  
28 in the slightest. They propose units without any  
29 reference to the financial position resulting; preferring  
30 to leave that to you, Mr. Commissioner. It seems to me





1 they don't present you with a proposal, they present you  
2 with a half proposal.

3                   It is our contention that these are  
4 to quite a degree defensive proposals, red herrings  
5 across the trail of your inquiry. We feel that you  
6 have a borough system now whose modification as a  
7 two-level system would necessarily relate to the  
8 boundaries of municipalities which exist today. I  
9 repeat that in London, England, there were not municipal  
10 boundaries to tie the central government when they  
11 introduced the borough system, except for the ancient  
12 City of London.

13                   I think one or two things ought to  
14 be mentioned because of this point that none of the  
15 submissions seem to suggest a damaging position for  
16 the proposer. Both the Reeve and the Solicitor for  
17 Scarboro, for example, spoke repeatedly, and their  
18 brief speaks of it, of the 300,000 figure as a suitable  
19 figure for a borough. Both mentioned the fact that  
20 when Scarboro reached 500,000 it might be necessary  
21 to divide it. Now this destroys the 300,000 figure,  
22 it seems to me, to put it in those terms.

23                   I don't propose to go through all  
24 the suburban submissions in this way. I make one point  
25 that a single small municipality seems to have taken  
26 a brave position and that is Long Branch. Long Branch  
27 is prepared to see its independent corporate existence  
28 come to an end.

29                   THE COMMISSIONER: It did not ask to  
30 be incorporated with Toronto!







1 MR. HARDY: No. Now as to what is  
2 being proposed and what the City wants; I think we  
3 have dealt with that as fully as we would like to do.  
4 I repeat our interest in the evaluation of the best  
5 possible size and form of Council, the best possible  
6 use of wards and districts, we are most anxious to make  
7 the best of bigness but we do say that a constituency  
8 of 72,000 for one alderman is not unreasonable for a  
9 great city and if some people feel this is on the large  
10 side you can still reduce that without creating a  
11 Council larger than in the biggest cities in the United  
12 States, let alone England or let alone Montreal.

13 We are talking practical politics in  
14 the proposal that is here before you. It is only one  
15 of a number of alternatives having to do with the most  
16 important question to be decided. Now in looking at  
17 the financial consequence of amalgamation we have  
18 attempted a somewhat complex analysis and we have  
19 gotten a little bit theoretical.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You sure have.

21 MR. HARDY: Because we want to make  
22 the point there very strongly that we do not think that  
23 the weight of taxation alone, the existing weight of  
24 taxation alone is the measure of equality. The measure  
25 of equality has to do with the service, the requirements,  
26 the effort extended. We have put in this somewhat  
27 theoretical material not to point the finger precisely  
28 at particular municipalities but to suggest to you that  
29 not only are there wide disparities in the existing  
30 levels of taxation but there are disparities and different





1 differences in the amount of tax being imposed in  
2 relation to the tax strength of the municipality  
3 concerned and the service requirements, the normal  
4 service requirements of such a municipality.

5 Now in the course of the hearings our  
6 financial calculations were the subject of some comment  
7 by the Metro Chairman, Mr. Allan. He referred to a  
8 newspaper story of April 14th which was headed up,  
9 I have the clipping here: "Dispute City Tax Gains  
10 if Merger".

11 Now I refer to this not for the  
12 reason of wanting to be critical of newspaper reporting  
13 but in order to make clear what the City's position  
14 is. The caption over this story and the content of  
15 the story could create an impression which is not  
16 accurate and as such form the basis of a comment by  
17 the Metropolitan Chairman which might not have been made  
18 if he had consulted with the people concerned. I am  
19 in a position to say quite categorically that there  
20 is no dispute, no difference of opinion between the  
21 City Commissioner of Finance and myself. We have been  
22 working together in preparation of financial material  
23 since last August. We have been working against deadline  
24 pressures and with competing responsibilities to  
25 occupy our time but we have carried the project along  
26 over the months and when we got to the point of producing  
27 a report as such we had not as much financial information  
28 available and in presentable form as we would have liked.  
29 As you know we consulted you about this problem and put  
30 in certain of the financial material in a supplement to







1 the main report which is incorporated into it which,  
2 like the main report, was approved by City Council in  
3 this instance without dissent.

4 In the development of these figures  
5 I was concerned particularly with the theoretical  
6 concept and with explaining a theoretical relationship:  
7 What does amalgamation itself mean to the Toronto area?  
8 Not what is going to happen in the City budgeting for  
9 the Toronto area. Now the Treasurer naturally is  
10 more accustomed to the other approach, that is looking  
11 at City budgeting and I suppose one might caption our  
12 respective emphasis by my emphasis on what could be  
13 and his emphasis on what would be under particular  
14 conditions.

15 I was prepared to make a theoretical  
16 assumption and to eliminate, as was explained to the  
17 City Council and the Board of Control on a couple of  
18 occasions, the expenditure which I know will take place  
19 and will continue because I wanted to isolate theoretically  
20 the facts of amalgamation per se.

21 Now, so much for this so-called difference  
22 of opinion. But let me go on to say a little more as to  
23 why I wanted to isolate and deal with this theoretical  
24 concept. I wanted to look at what could be charged to  
25 the account of amalgamation as such in the changes which  
26 will come as Toronto grows and changes if amalgamation  
27 takes place. I wanted to do so because it seems to me  
28 that this is the fair way to look at the question.

29 It does not tell people what their tax  
30







1 position will be, but it does tell one what amalgamation  
2 will have done to influence, to alter their tax  
3 position, and these are distinguishable concepts as  
4 I see it.

5                   Now, there was another reason for  
6 going with this theoretical approach and eliminating  
7 what I call transition costs despite the fact that  
8 transition costs would exist and the principal one  
9 of these being the cost of maintaining a larger  
10 complement of staff in certain areas of the establishment  
11 than would be needed in relation to the work which  
12 they would have to perform in future.

13                   I suggested to the City Council, and  
14 I repeat here today because of this point being  
15 introduced, that Toronto's growth rate corresponds  
16 to the addition of a Peterborough or a Brantford  
17 year by year, and there is some absorbtive capacity  
18 for what would otherwise be surplus staff if you ceased  
19 hiring when you have that kind of gross rate. You  
20 have, therefore, people going into positions elsewhere  
21 without you hiring, and you have, even in a static  
22 municipality, you have an expected staff turnover  
23 through retirement and voluntary departures, so we  
24 expected this would have a bearing on the situation too,  
25 in addition to the growth rate, and it should be borne  
26 in mind that the Province did meet some very definite  
27 and very sizeable transition costs when Metro was  
28 formed. I made reference to that chapter and verse earlier  
29 in this hearing today, and I take it I need not repeat  
30 it. It may very well be that a recommendation would be





1 forthcoming to repeat the process. We don't know.

2 In fact, we are not pressing this point; we are just  
3 saying this is a possibility.

4 A further point is that we are living  
5 in an age when municipal services are expanding without  
6 population growth, and certain services need expansion  
7 aside from the pressures that amalgamation would put  
8 on the municipality to expand them if the community  
9 felt it could afford to make such an expansion.

10 I have referred to the enlargement  
11 of the City's community recreation programme over the  
12 past decade, and certainly from everything I can gather  
13 there would be room for some expansion throughout the  
14 suburban areas. While this would not be an amalgamation  
15 cost, and while such a development could be staged  
16 according to the wishes of the Council which then hold  
17 office, the successive Councils which hold office, yet  
18 I expect this kind of thing could happen.

19 We have had it happen in Metro. The  
20 policing operation was enlarged when Metro was formed,  
21 and while you have had some question raised about  
22 policing, whether it has a sufficient local character,  
23 you have not had a substantial battery of criticism  
24 coming forward in this community that the amount of the  
25 force, the size of the establishment is too great.  
26 Indeed there was brought forward in evidence the  
27 suggestion that a further expansion was called for.  
28 I say, therefore, we were trying to isolate and identify  
29 what amalgamation would mean in itself, and that is the  
30 basis of our calculation.







1 Now, I want to say this about all such  
2 calculations. In the short term for every winner there  
3 is a loser, and you heard in the opening statement  
4 the Mayor's position that the City of Toronto says  
5 whether we are winners or losers we want amalgamation  
6 to go forward. If we are losers of representation, we  
7 accept this fact and we accept it because this puts  
8 us in the position of promoting what is for the greater  
9 good of the area.

10 The benefits which are benefits  
11 in toto we suggest are long term benefits. Short-term  
12 accounting is wins and losses, and in all these  
13 figures that Toronto is putting forward our purpose  
14 is not to show that Toronto will be a winner. Our  
15 purpose is to show that changes will and can be held  
16 within reason in tax levels. Taxes will not jump  
17 sharply; need not jump sharply; that the changes  
18 will be in the direction of greater equity; that the  
19 changes can be staged and cushioned if you will.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, Mr. Hardy,  
21 on page 116 of your brief you say in effect that  
22 under amalgamation there would be a  $2\frac{1}{2}$  mill reduction  
23 in residential taxation and 3 mills in commercial  
24 taxation. You are now saying that may not necessarily  
25 be the case? Is that not right?

26 MR. HARDY: I think the answer to that,  
27 Mr. Commissioner, is based upon putting it under its  
28 heading, "A Budget For An Amalgamated Municipality". We  
29 do not have the official responsibility of such a  
30 budget.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: No.

2 MR. HARDY: This is merely one budget  
3 which might be put forward which would fit into the  
4 scheme of things, so you are quite correct in saying  
5 we do not say this is what will happen. What will happen  
6 will depend on a whole variety of courses which impinge  
7 upon the problem of the budget makers if amalgamation  
8 goes through.

9 However, we do say this, and the burden  
10 of our brief is this, that there will be two things  
11 happening. There will be a pressure to eliminate what  
12 we call substandard services as quickly as this can be  
13 done. We say that the Toronto area is not poor, and  
14 it should be able to eliminate substandard services. It  
15 should have a fiscal capacity to do so if it harnesses  
16 it, and then we say there would be some administrative  
17 savings from merger as we see it, and we can identify  
18 some of them to our satisfaction.

19 We say furthermore that we see no  
20 counterbalancing administrative additions in the other  
21 direction. We see the savings as coming in, and we see  
22 on the basis of the size and nature of the operation that  
23 the present economical level of operating that applies in  
24 Toronto can continue with its extension to this larger  
25 area.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: But you are also  
27 saying -- I want to have this clear, and I appreciate  
28 your frankness -- you are saying that perhaps instead  
29 of a reduction of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  mills or 3 mills as the case may  
30 be, there may be an increase in taxation with amalgamation





1 because the cost of eliminating substandard services  
2 may be greater than the savings that would be effected  
3 under amalgamation?

4 MR. HARDY: Yes, but I should point  
5 out this very clearly: This budgetary calculation  
6 presumes elimination of those services which our  
7 department heads know and feel to be substandard. Crucial  
8 inadequacies. Actually if you put a department head  
9 to work on budgeting, you get different levels of  
10 bullishness and bearishness, if I may put it that way,  
11 in the way they strike their estimates, and in going  
12 over this material we had their comments as to the  
13 service situation. We had their views as to the  
14 financial changes that ought to be related to that, and  
15 this was reviewed, gone over by Mr. Campbell and myself  
16 and his staff in their O. and M. Division, and the  
17 responsibility for the budget really is--it is an  
18 official consultant's budget, if I may put it that way,  
19 based on the best information and opinions from  
20 circulating Departments. It does take into account, for  
21 example, quite clearly and definitely and to a good  
22 generous amount the elimination of volunteers from the  
23 fire fighting operation.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: But it does not  
25 take into account the likelihood that personnel would  
26 be retained whether they are needed or not. You say  
27 that yourself.

28 MR. HARDY: That is correct. That is  
29 correct.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: And that is an







1 important consideration.

2 MR. HARDY: Personnel which is service.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You assume that all  
4 personnel that is not required will be eliminated,  
5 which you know will not happen.

6 MR. HARDY: Right.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Therefore your  
8 estimate of savings of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  mills really does not mean  
9 anything.

10 MR. HARDY: Well, Mr. Commissioner, I  
11 would hope that we got along far enough that you would  
12 think it meant something, but it does not mean something  
13 which is very simple and direct. That is, you cannot  
14 take this and say this is a mill rate production.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I understand.  
16 I am saying this in fairness to you and Mr. Campbell.  
17 I realize the task you face. I am saying this in  
18 fairness. At that  $2\frac{1}{2}$  mills, assuming it were reached,  
19 would be a savings of \$25.00 on a house assessed at  
20 \$5,000.00? Isn't that right? You go on to say that if  
21 the present system of partial graded exemption --

22 MR. HARDY: That arithmetic I do not  
23 think is right, is it?

24 MR. CAMPBELL: Saving to the City;  
25 not to the whole area.

26 THE COMMISSIONER:  $2\frac{1}{2}$  mills on \$5,000.00,  
27 on a \$5,000.00 assessment would be what?

28 MR. CAMPBELL: \$12.50.

29 MR. HARDY: I'm sorry, I thought you  
30 said \$25.00.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, if I did I  
2 did not mean that. \$12.50.

3 MR. HARDY: I just wanted to correct  
4 your arithmetic.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: I am trying to show  
6 you how narrow the range within which you are working.  
7 You go on to say that the system of partial graded  
8 exemptions would have to be reconsidered, which is  
9 right, because the system applies only to Toronto and  
10 New Toronto.

11 MR. HARDY: Right.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: And there you say  
13 very casually, you want me to infer very casually  
14 it does not make very much difference because the most  
15 that would be saved on a \$4,000.00 house is \$33.00.  
16 \$12.50 is a lot less than \$33.00.

17 The point I am trying to make is that  
18 with all the qualifications in your brief you are not  
19 seriously suggesting that there will be a reduction in  
20 taxation in the event of amalgamation?

21 MR. HARDY: Well, Mr. Commissioner,  
22 what I am suggesting is this: That the reduction which  
23 we set up there in relation to the pattern of eliminating  
24 the partial graded exemption which we have put into  
25 our calculations, and recognized, that this reduction is  
26 a real figure as best we can estimate it aside from  
27 transition costs of carrying surplus personnel.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

29 MR. HARDY: As I say, this is an area  
30 where the Province has come to the rescue before. This







1 is an area where the dimensions of the problem are  
2 really very unpredictable because of our healthy  
3 economy, our rapid growth rate and so on.

4 Now, it depends upon the adaptability  
5 of the people. If you have a surplus of people in the  
6 Public Works Department, they may not be able to serve  
7 you in the Health Department, for example. So you  
8 may have actually the position of some surplus personnel  
9 where you have to go out and do some hiring.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: On top of retaining  
11 the surplus personnel?

12 MR. HARDY: Yes, but we also have here  
13 a very dynamic situation with this growth rate, and  
14 with the extent of time over which this is being looked  
15 at. Bear in mind this, if amalgamation is recommended,  
16 such a recommendation will be known presumably I would  
17 say a full year before that amalgamated municipality  
18 could possibly become operative. I would say a full  
19 twelve months. This actually gives you twelve months  
20 during which there will be some voluntary adjustment  
21 if times are good. If municipal employment opportunities  
22 are strong. If they are not strong, you will have a  
23 smaller adjustment during that twelve-month period.

24 Now, there is another point, that this  
25 surplus staff will in part be put to work on what is a  
26 transition job, the pain of changeover, as it were.  
27 And on the other hand, it does seem to me it would be  
28 wrong to call any temporary cost of this sort, which  
29 amount is not clearly determinable, a cost of  
30 amalgamation without very serious qualifications, and I





1 have preferred to look at it the other way around and  
2 talk about trend cost of amalgamation without temporary  
3 transition fluctuations which amalgamation when effected  
4 would produce.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Apart from this  
6 personnel problem which would not present itself, you  
7 very frankly point out in your brief as you have in  
8 your remarks, that the budget on which you based your  
9 estimate was related to 1962 operations. You added that  
10 municipal operations have grown and are continuing to  
11 grow regardless of the problem of amalgamation.

12 MR. HARDY: Yes.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Therefore, that  
14 estimate you made without the qualifications you have  
15 today added to it is no longer valid.

16 MR. HARDY: No, but I wouldn't want  
17 the wrong impression to be left here, Mr. Commissioner,  
18 from this point. The truth of it is that the changes  
19 which have taken place in the intervening period and  
20 which will continue may be of such a nature that they  
21 reduce the financial problem of drawing an amalgamated  
22 budget. We have already, you see, the change in  
23 financial responsibility for welfare.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

25 MR. HARDY: Which was not taken into  
26 account here.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: No.

28 MR. HARDY: And education costs. Major  
29 changes. Now, in effect those adjustments we are  
30 digesting right now, and they will reduce the amount of





1 adjustment that is required to complete the process.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but they  
3 won't have reduced the overall costs; they will reduce  
4 adjustments.

5 MR. HARDY: Yes, quite so, but we are  
6 concerned with changes in the mill rate, and I want to  
7 underline in relation to that this fundamental point:  
8 It seems to me that the amalgamated municipality has  
9 the effect of distributing the cost of services in the  
10 way which is most obviously fair, and that the Toronto  
11 area, if amalgamated, has the obvious capacity to pay  
12 for its local government. I am convinced that on both  
13 scores we are on sound ground.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: What you are saying  
15 now is this: That the mill rate may be higher but the  
16 burden will be more equitably distributed?

17 MR. HARDY: And there will be good value  
18 for the tax dollar, yes, sir.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I think you have  
20 clarified that, Mr. Hardy.

21 MR. HARDY: The one other point I would  
22 like to refer to there is this partial graded exemption.  
23 I do not want to labour the point, but I do think that  
24 there has been for one thing a degree of overemphasis  
25 in the Metropolitan Chairman's presentation, because he  
26 has talked about the number of taxpayers in a way which  
27 produces an inequitable figure compared to the figure  
28 of the number of properties. We have less than 62,000  
29 properties and he is using the device of saying in  
30 some cases there is joint ownership. So to cover that







1   eventuality I will multiply part of my figure by two.  
2   I really think unless one is aware of this, when he  
3   brings out a figure of 90% it could be misleading. I  
4   feel some obligation to describe the figure he is using  
5   to you.

6                   THE COMMISSIONER: But I assure you,  
7   Mr. Hardy, with respect to the graded exemption -- and  
8   you know that I know something about it -- I shall only  
9   be using the official figure.

10                  MR. HARDY: Quite. Now then, the  
11   further point I want to make is this. It seems to me  
12   that in this process of debating future form of  
13   government in which we are engaged, not to the same  
14   extent as one would be in a Municipal Board hearing,  
15   but none the less there is this element about the  
16   appearances before a Royal Commission that in this  
17   debating it is hardly possible for people in the debate  
18   to have it both ways with respect to the partial graded  
19   exemption. It either is a real and proper benefit  
20   for property holders of small dwellings, in which event  
21   Toronto is to be commended for having it and it ought  
22   to be extended to others under an amalgamated municipality,  
23   or it is a glorious device for apportioning a benefit  
24   which does not give the money necessarily to the whole  
25   group of those who are most deserving and in the  
26   process draws excess taxation from others who perhaps  
27   can ill afford it, because for every benefit there is  
28   somebody paying the cost of that privilege.

29                  As I say, you cannot have it both ways.  
30   Either this is a good arrangement which ought to be





1 continued and which Toronto ought to be commended for  
2 having or it is a bad arrangement and its removal as  
3 a consequence of amalgamation will benefit the  
4 community.

5 Now I know you have yourself in your  
6 Royal Commission inquiry in Winnipeg dealt with this  
7 problem in its broadest terms and quite specifically  
8 as well, and I therefore think it would be impudent of  
9 me to try and direct you in any sense in this matter.  
10 I know of the terms of reference and I know of your  
11 report thoroughly from cover to cover.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: The difference being  
13 that in Winnipeg it never was in existence and here it  
14 was.

15 MR. HARDY: Quite so, so that the  
16 problem here is a more thorny one and it did bother  
17 the Province. I think it would be certainly very worth-  
18 while to make the closest inquiries as to what happened  
19 in 1955 when under the Ministership of Mr. Goodfellow  
20 it was first proposed that the legislation be struck  
21 from the provincial statutes and Toronto and New Toronto  
22 be forced to give up the difference altogether -- the  
23 modified position that was taken as a result of protests  
24 from Toronto and New Toronto and the question as to  
25 whether or not this arrangement might have been done away  
26 with in stages; a position which was explored by the  
27 City.

28 This is all very complex and I regard  
29 amalgamation as actually forcing a thorny problem to be  
30 looked at, faced squarely and dealt with to produce a







1 constructive result. I do not say this is easy.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Whatever the  
3 position you say in your brief it will affect 62,000  
4 properties?

5 MR. HARDY: That is correct.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: And since the  
7 government about eight years ago decided to abolish it  
8 outside of Toronto and New Toronto the result is that  
9 it might not see fit to extend it to the whole area  
10 at this stage?

11 MR. HARDY: Quite so.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Because there are  
13 other municipalities, I am told, in Ontario outside of  
14 Metropolitan Toronto.

15 MR. HARDY: We are well aware of that.  
16 As a matter of fact I have been interested in this  
17 partial exemption for years. We are well aware of the  
18 fact that this legislation put on as a soldiers' benefit  
19 after World War I was taken up by only two municipalities  
20 in the whole Province -- the two Torontos, the City  
21 of Toronto and the Town of New Toronto. We quite  
22 appreciate the situation here.

23 I would like to add two minor points  
24 here. I think the main points have been stated. The  
25 first is that we do think that the amount of tax  
26 reduction in these averages set out in this table is  
27 valuable in that it presents the picture accurately.  
28 That is on page 120.

29 In the discussions we have had on this  
30 problem in 1955 and now and all through the years in fact,





1 the extent of the financial repercussions have tended  
2 to be greatly exaggerated by some uninformed people  
3 and we are attempting to put in a table which is  
4 informative. That is our purpose.

5           The second point is that if, as some  
6 people have suggested, it would be reasonable for a  
7 municipality like Leaside, which has enjoyed a privilege  
8 of another kind, to have it at the expense of other  
9 taxpayers; if it were regarded as reasonable to stage  
10 the change in Leaside's tax rate from where it now  
11 stands, or where it stands at the time, to where it  
12 ought to stand in an amalgamated municipality, in  
13 stages over five years, then it would be a matter of  
14 equity to similarly stage the change in the tax level  
15 for those now enjoying the partial exemption in Toronto.  
16 If you are going to do outright surgery in one case  
17 it should be done in both. There is a very direct  
18 parallel there.

19           Do I make my point?

20           THE COMMISSIONER: I think you do, yes.

21           MR. HARDY: That is everything I wanted  
22 to say on finance. I see that I have not quite made my  
23 objective on time. I would like to speak briefly about  
24 this matter of political acceptability, if I may. There  
25 is one point I am anxious to get in there. And that  
26 pretty well concludes my presentation.

27           This question of political acceptability  
28 is a thorny one.

29           THE COMMISSIONER: You mean if only  
30 things did not have to be politically acceptable?





1 MR. HARDY: Well, I do not want to  
2 seem superior in any sense. I do not want to seem  
3 isolated over the very real fears and wishes of people  
4 -- and I am sure that you cannot feel that you want  
5 to in your position either. But this is not a problem  
6 which is of the same extent regardless of how one deals  
7 with it. It is like a garden in which you can plant  
8 some things which will grow.

9 The political acceptability of change  
10 is one thing that has to be sold to people at the local  
11 level because this is of the essence of local government.  
12 So this concerns us and it concerns us very much.

13 Now, this is a subject which is complex  
14 and which we contend is properly dealt with in being  
15 looked at by a Royal Commission with a qualified staff  
16 of specialists and reviewed by a government which can  
17 reinforce that work with its own qualified staff and  
18 so on. In other words, we say that this is an issue which  
19 is not to be settled by petition, plebiscite or poll. We  
20 think it is quite apparent that this is not how such  
21 an issue should be settled.

22 Now, such devices can at times be more  
23 damaging than helpful and this is a subject on which  
24 the Ontario Municipal Board for example has expressed  
25 itself frequently. I remember in the Windsor hearings  
26 the Chairman of the Board made a lengthy statement on  
27 the point. It is of great concern to them because there  
28 is very limited provision for eliciting information  
29 in the legislation relating to boundary assessments.  
30 It is all very closely confined.







1                   There is often in the hearings a  
2 suggestion that there should be more reliance on these  
3 devices than is allowed for in law. So we are concerned  
4 about this, but we are also concerned that the public  
5 should know and understand changes and should find  
6 them acceptable. We have written this little section  
7 in which we talk about this subject and I hope we  
8 say something constructive in relation to what happened  
9 in 1950 and where we stand today.

10                   There is one thing that might have been  
11 done by the City of Toronto because of a particular  
12 point in the OMB report of 1953. The Council made a  
13 point in its submission to the Board that the opinion  
14 of suburban Councils did not coincide with the opinion  
15 of the suburban populace and the Municipal Board noted  
16 that the City had failed to demonstrate that such a  
17 difference did exist between Council and public.

18                   Now we suggest in this statement certain  
19 points which might be noted which bear on this problem  
20 and we have suggested that the Municipal Board was  
21 perhaps not dealing with this subject in the best  
22 possible manner. But be that as it may, it would be  
23 nice to have a poll, a petition, a plebiscite -- anything  
24 of this sort -- to reassure one that the opinions of  
25 Councils do not coincide with the opinions of their  
26 constituents in such proceedings.

27                   So the Mayor of Toronto on a radio or  
28 television broadcast, I believe, threw out a challenge  
29 on this point some little time back and the CBC picked  
30 it up, as you, Mr. Commissioner, may know. They hired a





1 firm which I have known of for seven or eight years.  
2 I think they are a reliable firm -- International Surveys  
3 Limited. They conducted a poll in the three strong  
4 Townships -- Scarboro, North York and Etobicoke. The  
5 results were presented on the air. They were reported  
6 in the press and I am sure that it could be followed  
7 up through the CBC.

8 I give you the position in Etobicoke  
9 so you will appreciate what these statistics mean. They  
10 reported over the radio or over the television that  
11 there were 35% in favour of merger, of amalgamation  
12 from those polls compared with 30% opposed. In other  
13 words, all those who had an opinion pro or con definitely  
14 the greater number was for. There were others who would  
15 advance no opinion. There were those who were doubtful  
16 and so on. I do not know the precise categories -- this  
17 could be looked up -- but in relation to that figure  
18 for Etobicoke, then, the number in favour in North  
19 York was 57% and in Scarboro 72%.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Did they all have  
21 to read your brief before voting?

22 MR. HARDY: I doubt very much if that  
23 was in the questioning of the interviewer.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: It was not a pre-  
25 requisite?

26 MR. HARDY: But I do say that you  
27 should have been in Toronto in the period 1950 when  
28 there was in effect a degree of barnstorming with  
29 one night stand people going from meeting to meeting.  
30 I well remember people like Frederick Gardiner storming







1 for amalgamation and Hiram McCallum, who was at  
2 this time Mayor. One thing from personal experience I  
3 might say is that I never went into a meeting and had  
4 a full opportunity to speak and came out with a majority  
5 vote against our position.

6 So I think there is something in  
7 presenting one's position, but I think also whatever  
8 the reasons for these attitudes -- and I am told (I do  
9 not know whether it is accurate) that the response  
10 when the suburban Reeves were confronted with the  
11 results of this poll was to suggest that the newspapers  
12 had been brainwashing the public.

13 Be that as it may, if there was validity  
14 to the Municipal Board's point as a reason for denying  
15 the amalgamation in 1950, to the same extent we have  
16 here up-to-date evidence standing to refute the point.  
17 If you attach little importance to the point at all,  
18 then you may attach little importance to this poll.  
19 We would not want it to be left in the position that  
20 this stand taken by the OMB in 1950 weighed heavily in  
21 your mind as a reason for being reluctant to recommend  
22 amalgamation in the face of the official opposition  
23 from the suburban Councils.

24 They have their job to do, and I say  
25 that I am convinced their position is they could not  
26 speak for their Councils if they did not speak for  
27 the existence of the corporate entity in most cases  
28 at least, for the continued existence of the corporate  
29 entity.

30 Mr. Commissioner, that completes my





1 presentation really other than to say that I do think  
2 the quotation of Thomas Jefferson on the final page  
3 is an apt one.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: That is only heresay  
5 evidence!

6 MR. HARDY: Now, I would like to say  
7 if you want to check the "heresay", it is engraven in  
8 stone on the Jefferson Monument in Washington.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: File it.

10 MR. HARDY: And finally might I say  
11 that I am sure the City of Toronto would want me to  
12 express to you, sir, the very deepest of appreciation  
13 for the patient attention which you have accorded to  
14 our verbal submissions, to the obvious amount of work  
15 which is represented in the questions which you have  
16 asked today so that you have dealt with plainly extremely  
17 conscientiously with the City's submission, and we  
18 hope further naturally that it commends itself to you.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
20 Mr. Hardy, for a very thorough brief, very helpfully  
21 presented today. The Commission will now adjourn  
22 until ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

23  
24 ---Whereupon the hearing was adjourned until  
25 Wednesday the 29th day of April, at 10:00 a.m.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30



**ROYAL COMMISSION**

**ON**

**METROPOLITAN  
TORONTO**

**HEARINGS**

**HELD AT**

**PARLIAMENT BLDGS.  
TORONTO**

**VOLUME No.: DATE:**

**5**

**APRIL 29, 1964.**

**OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO  
364-5865 364-7383**







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1  
2  
3 ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
4

5  
6 Hearings of the Royal Commission  
7 on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
8 the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
9 Ontario, on Wednesday, April 29th,  
10 1964, commencing at 10.00 a.m.,  
11 et seq.  
12

13  
14 PRESENT:

15 H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C. Commissioner

16 F. H. Finnis Secretary

17 L. Feldman Research Officer

18 T. Plunkett Municipal Consultant  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD

507 - 561

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE  
CITY OF TORONTO

562 - 595

A GROUP OF TRUSTEES OF THE  
TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION

596 - 608

\* \* \* \* \*







SUBMISSION OF  
THE METROPOLITAN SCHOOL BOARD

Appearances:

Mr. Andrew Davidson	Chairman
Mr. Jack Parker	Vice-Chairman
Mr. W. J. McCordic	Executive Secretary

Trustees

Professor W. B. Coutts  
Mr. Barry G. Lowes  
Mr. John V. Mills

Members of School Board

Mr. A. Adamson  
Mr. H. Eve  
Mrs. Irene McBrien  
Mr. E. Jones  
Mr. Wm. R. Stainsby

---

THE COMMISSIONER: The Metropolitan  
School Board, is it Mr. Stainsby?

MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Commissioner, I am  
Andrew Davidson. I am Chairman of the Metropolitan  
School Board. Mr. Stainsby is here. He will be  
here this afternoon with the Toronto School Board.

THE COMMISSIONER: I was confused. Do  
you want to introduce your associates for the record?

MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, I am  
accompanied by the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Jack Parker,





1 who is Chairman of the Etobicoke Board of Education;  
2 also by Professor Coutts, who is Chairman of the  
3 Finance Committee; the Reverend J. B. Mills, who is  
4 Chairman of the Legislation and Bylaws; and Mr.  
5 Lowes, who is Chairman of the Building and Site  
6 Committee. In addition there are present other  
7 members of the School Board. There is Trustee Mrs.  
8 Irene McBrien, Trustee Mr. Adamson, Trustee Mr. Eve,  
9 Trustee Mr. Jones, and Trustee Stainsby. There are  
10 members of the staff of the Metropolitan School Board,  
11 Mr. McCordic, who is the Executive Secretary; Mr.  
12 Forman, the Financial Secretary; and Dr. Ridge,  
13 Director of Research.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought you had  
15 transferred Mr. McCordic to my staf.

16 MR. DAVIDSON: I am glad to hear he has  
17 been infiltrating. This means he has been on the  
18 job we have assigned him.

19 As the first speaker of the educational  
20 contingent I would wish to welcome you, sir, to these  
21 -- I should not say "surroundings" as you have been  
22 here -- but to participation in our problems. I  
23 consider that this is a benefit that we have received  
24 from the provincial government, probably of a far  
25 greater merit than any of the financial grants they  
26 have sent us, is the presence of yourself and your  
27 Commission which will help us with the problems which  
28 we confess confuse us and for which we have diligently  
29 sought solutions but really cannot say that we have  
30 brought even suggested positive solutions to this





1 meeting.

2 We have some very firm ideas. We have  
3 not worked out our suggestions completely even amongst  
4 ourselves, being a very heterogeneous group, but we  
5 do count on your wisdom later on and we know that the  
6 contents of your report will assist us in the period  
7 that follows which we feel will surely be culminated  
8 by some amendments to existing legislation and ways  
9 out of our existing difficulties.

10 This particular School Board, being  
11 widely representative, does not feel that it has a  
12 position to defend. We have been doing what we can.  
13 We would like to work more efficiently in the future  
14 than we have been able to do in the past.

15 Now I have a few remarks, sir, and then  
16 I would direct your attention to certain aspects of  
17 the report which I know you and your staff have very  
18 fully investigated already. Would that be in order?

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

20 MR. DAVIDSON: First of all, I think we  
21 should identify ourselves not personally but our  
22 capacity. All of us members of the Metropolitan  
23 School Board are by definition members of a local  
24 school board. This means that we have a dual capacity  
25 and almost unavoidable, at least on the surface, con-  
26 flicting loyalties. Now the members from the suburban  
27 municipalities are either the Chairman of the  
28 municipality or someone selected by the Chairman.  
29 The members of the City of Toronto Board of Education,  
30 who comprise about half of the Metropolitan Board, are







1           selected in rather a more capricious manner.   In  
2   the nine wards the candidate receiving the highest  
3   number of votes in each ward becomes the Metropolitan  
4   representative, as well as representing his ward on  
5   the city Board of Education.   This means that we  
6   Toronto people cannot say, with the exception of our  
7   Chairman, who sits here by right as being Chairman  
8   of the Toronto Board, that we have been selected  
9   particularly for this task.   This has left us for  
10   some time wondering to what extent we represent our  
11   City of Toronto and how that jibes with the feeling  
12   that we should be representing the whole Metropolitan  
13   area.

14               We are therefore sitting before a  
15   perpetual dilemma.   I think we should face the fact,  
16   and I don't think my fellow members of the Metropolitan  
17   Board would object to my saying this, that the City  
18   of Toronto Board is a Board which costs money to belong  
19   to this club.   We are either wondering to what  
20   extent we should be contributing or in the case of  
21   the suburban representative, certainly in the large  
22   growing suburbs, most of them are wondering to what  
23   extent they should be seeking financial help from the  
24   Metropolitan School Board as a whole.

25               If you add up these factors and try and  
26   make decisions on a Metropolitan basis you are running  
27   an efficient schoolboard and this, as you know, would  
28   not be an easy proposition and it is not easy decisions  
29   that we make.   We do feel, however, that in the great  
30   majority of the cases that come before us a common





1 feeling for the community of Metropolitan Toronto  
2 has prevailed the sessions of the Metropolitan School  
3 Board and we have remarked amongst each other very  
4 often that there will be a lengthy debate, sometimes  
5 even a bitter debate at the Metropolitan School Board  
6 which is concluded by a vote which is almost unanimous.  
7 It is a session which has the ability to talk itself  
8 into a nearly unanimous decision.

9 Such was the case when the report which  
10 is before you was submitted to the School Board for  
11 approval.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You mean the brief?

13 MR. DAVIDSON: The brief, sir. The  
14 brief was approved by the School Board by a vote of  
15 20 -- 2. True, it avoided coming out on the one  
16 side on the contentious issue of amalgamation, the  
17 borough system. It did, however, do this. It  
18 recommends to you, sir, for consideration the fact  
19 that the eleven municipalities should certainly not  
20 remain as eleven. This brief was supported by a  
21 vote which was close to being unanimous.

22 Now if I may in a series of questions  
23 ask what is our problem and call your attention to  
24 a quotation which I beg permission to read from an  
25 earlier report on the case for equalization of  
26 educational opportunity in Metro Toronto. It was  
27 used as a frontispiece and was originally written  
28 by Mr. Lorne Cumming, Chairman of the Municipal Board:

29 "The combined resources of the entire  
30 area are to be made available to support







1 education and to overcome the most serious  
2 inequities of the present situation where  
3 some parts of the area do not have the  
4 financial resources required to provide  
5 even the bare essentials in the way of  
6 education while others, because of the  
7 concentration of non-residential assess-  
8 ments or for other reasons, have taxable  
9 resources which in comparison are much  
10 greater than their needs."

11 We note it is only in comparison they  
12 are greater than the needs, but the comparison between  
13 areas well endowed with industry and commerce and  
14 those suburbs which can be called dormitory in  
15 nature continues to be very marked.

16 There is one point which no longer has  
17 relevance. That is the phrase "Some parts of the  
18 area do not have the financial resources required  
19 to provide even the bare essentials in the way of  
20 education." No member of the Metropolitan School  
21 Board would today suggest that there are parts of  
22 Metropolitan Toronto where the bare essentials of  
23 education are not being provided.

24 The function of Metro over the ten years  
25 of its existence has helped but not completely solved,  
26 particularly in two areas. There is the area of  
27 capital finance and the assistance to different  
28 municipalities in the financing of their current  
29 operation. At the beginning of this year indeed  
30 you can say that the Metropolitan area, with regard





1 only to capital financing, actually achieved amalga-  
2 mation with the exception of features of the schools  
3 which have never been defined by formula as essential  
4 to every shool.

5 The Metropolitan Corporation is now  
6 assuming one hundred per cent of the costs of the  
7 essential parts of the new schools, providing they  
8 are built in accordance with the Metropolitan formula.  
9 For various reasons some municipalities find that the  
10 building costs are high and an extreme solidarity of  
11 building in the centre part of the city is perhaps  
12 very necessary; and some parts find there are special  
13 features they want so it is not in fact one hundred  
14 per cent that Metropolitan is responsible and pro-  
15 vides for capital expansion but for the essentials  
16 of education that has been achieved.

17 This is very recent. This was accepted  
18 by provincial legislation in 1958 and by the Metro-  
19 politan School Board and Metropolitan Council in 1964,  
20 at the beginning of this year.

21 As far as the maintenance assistance  
22 payments are concerned the original recommendation  
23 of the provincial government was that they should  
24 provide for about sixty per cent of the operating costs  
25 of schools.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Where did you get that  
27 figure of sixty per cent? Does it appear anywhere?

28 MR. DAVIDSON: They figured it was a  
29 cost of \$147 per public school pupil at that time.  
30 The figure has a pleasant ring to it. They figured





1 that was the cost in Scarborough and by the time the  
2 legislation was effective \$150 could be a suitable  
3 base payment. Now this worked out over all to be  
4 60 per cent. At that time, of course, the whole idea  
5 of separating the education costs was very new and  
6 larger payments would have made an extreme and sudden  
7 impact on the central core so that this figure seemed  
8 to be successful.

9 We attempted in the Metropolitan School  
10 Board to keep to that 60 per cent figure but for  
11 reasons which I think will come out as we look at the  
12 report it was difficult to keep it up and it broke  
13 down, as it were, to 50 per cent. Last year a most  
14 unfortunate situation arose where some municipalities  
15 with forethought and reason and not with malice used  
16 the amount of the payments as a disciplinary weapon  
17 in connection with arguments about the rates of  
18 salaries of teachers. When this situation no longer  
19 arose in 1964 those same municipalities felt they  
20 could afford to revert closer to the 60 per cent.  
21 Although it is impossible to calculate what one year's  
22 taxes will raise it is thought we have reverted at  
23 the present time to the 60 per cent figure success-  
24 fully.

25 Now as we make these adjustments things  
26 happen. I feel the Metropolitan School Board is in  
27 many ways like the frog which was trying to climb out  
28 of the well. He goes up two feet and slips back one.  
29 Eventually the frog, of course, lands on the level.  
30 I hope that we will too. We never feel that is quite







1 guaranteed. Perhaps it is to provide for us the  
2 level or the plateau on which we can rest that you  
3 have come to us.

4 What have we done ourselves to survey  
5 our problems? We have been blessed with a very  
6 capable staff consisting of our Executive Secretary,  
7 Mr. McCordic, who has been with us throughout and has  
8 been of assistance in secretarial and financial  
9 capacities. He has produced, under the direction of the  
10 School Board, and in some of the cases with a great deal  
11 of plain, ordinary hard work on the part of the members  
12 of the School Board, five major reports.

13 The first one was not entirely ours. It  
14 was commissioned to Mr. Hardy who appeared before you  
15 yesterday on behalf of the City of Toronto because it  
16 was a report on means of taxation, something that is  
17 not strictly within the field of the School Board.

18 Mr. Hardy came to the conclusion that  
19 we had not yet really reached the stage, this was two  
20 or three years ago, at which the municipal taxpayer  
21 could say he was not getting value for his educational  
22 dollar and being outrageously put upon for education.

23 Nonetheless there has been since that  
24 time considerable effort on the part of the Province  
25 and the Dominion to release us from particularly our  
26 capital needs in the educational picture. The very  
27 general programme of educational buildings on the part  
28 of the Dominion and the Province working in cooperation  
29 have saved the day for our capital programme. Without  
30 it we would be literally gasping for breath and not





1 able to make what we consider is a reasoned assessment  
2 of our position.

3 The second one was a study referred to on  
4 pages 28 and 29 of the brief before you on the various  
5 ways in which we could equalize the burden over the  
6 different parts of the Metropolitan area. There were  
7 six proposals in which figures were taken and it was  
8 calculated what would have happened if a certain  
9 proposal had been adopted.

10 The first was the possibility of fixing  
11 the maintenance assistance payment at increasingly  
12 higher percentage of average cost. The difficulty is  
13 that the rain of dollars fell equally on the just and  
14 the unjust. I won't say which division was just and  
15 which was unjust. Someone was getting more than  
16 ever it was intended. This is a hypothetical  
17 exploration on our part.

18 The next four proposals explored the  
19 possibility of making maintenance assistance payments  
20 inversely proportionate to the assessment per pupil.  
21 When this was drafted as a proposal it seemed to be  
22 ideal and almost foolproof. The funny thing was  
23 when it worked out in actual tax dollars it was not  
24 as mathematically simple as it seemed. So tantalizing,  
25 however, was that that four separate schemes of  
26 varying degrees of inverse proportion were tried and  
27 the final proposal envisaged a ceiling mill rate where-  
28 by revenues raised by rates in excess of the ceiling  
29 would be spread among the members with lower rates.  
30







1 None of these appeared to make a sufficient  
2 indent on the problem that the School Board wished to  
3 recommend/to the Province, or in the case where they  
4 could have been adopted without legislation, even to its  
5 own members. When I say "without legislation", I call  
6 your attention, Mr. Commissioner, to the fact that one  
7 feature of the maintenance assistance payments has been  
8 throughout that they be paid equally on the basis of  
9 enrollment to each municipality.

10 We have, therefore, had the difficulty that  
11 helping the municipality which appeared to be in dire  
12 straits, it was necessary to help even more municipalities  
13 which were not in equally dire straits.

14 Thirdly, we produced a report which is called  
15 the Equalization of Educational Opportunity in Metropol-  
16 itan Toronto. This was a major effort on the part of  
17 trustees and officials, and went so far as to outline  
18 schemes of organization for a borough system, for a  
19 unitary system, and indicated how trustees may be elected,  
20 advisory committees, and how directors, supervisors,  
21 superintendents and business officials would be organized.  
22 We felt that this was a step forward. It was presented  
23 to all the trustees in the area, but we did not think  
24 the time was ripe when education alone was facing a re-  
25 organization, to produce it as something we would push  
26 for immediately. However, it is a report which is now  
27 very much apropos, and has assisted us in the preparation  
28 of the brief before you.

29 Finally, two reports have come forth in 1963  
30 and 1964. This one, sir, which you commissioned and we





1 are grateful to you for - I wouldn't like to say for  
2 depriving Mr. McCordic of his summer holidays because  
3 I know it is a holiday to him to sit down and draw from  
4 his capacious memory the history of this area - but we  
5 are grateful to you for this, a document which I think  
6 will always be in libraries and useful to students of  
7 municipal affairs.

8 I might say in passing, Mr. Commissioner,  
9 this was prepared at your direction by our staff. It  
10 was reviewed by the Executive members of the School Board.  
11 It was not - we would not say it was the work of the  
12 School Board members, however.

13 This one, the brief which is now before you,  
14 was presented to the School Board members in draft form  
15 before it was written up, and was frequently reviewed by  
16 well-attended and enthusiastic trustees who went over it  
17 really with a fine toothcomb. One of the trustees who  
18 took a great interest in this was Trustee Mrs. Grossberg,  
19 the Chairman of our Accommodation Committee. She is  
20 unable to be present today as she is serving on a  
21 Provincial Committee which is investigating the status  
22 of grade 13, but her interest in this report was very  
23 great, and she finally agreed to vote in accordance with  
24 the proposals, but she did not do so without letting the  
25 interests of the pioneering, small, but very significant,  
26 education municipality of Forest Hill be very well pro-  
27 tected in the report.

28 In addition to this kind of thing, and it  
29 has occurred to me one really might have applied for  
30 second class mail and issued these things monthly and





1 saved ourselves some expense and put out a Metropolitan  
2 School Board magazine - in addition to this, another  
3 interesting thing has been done by the financial  
4 secretaries under Mr. McCordic's direction. They have  
5 prepared a scoreboard of gains and losses resulting from  
6 amalgamation. This has its bad side and its good side.  
7 The bad side you might say is it has been spotlighting  
8 the wrong thing. That is, the amount that municipalities  
9 have been giving to other municipalities.

10 The good side is that it has presented a  
11 realistic and documented background of what Metropolitan  
12 Government has meant. We could do this. City Council  
13 and Metropolitan municipality could not do it.

14 Once they had amalgamated their police force  
15 for instance, it became impossible to reveal any more  
16 just what it was costing to police certain sections of  
17 the City under the amalgamated force. Schools have had  
18 the good sense by and large to remain in the same place,  
19 and we have been able to tell exactly what the situation  
20 would have been had the earlier arrangement stood, and to  
21 compare them with the situation under the Metropolitan  
22 arrangement.

23 These forecasts and reviews have been very  
24 valuable to the members of the School Board in making up  
25 their minds on such things as assumption of capital  
26 responsibility and the payment of maintenance assistance  
27 payments.

28 Now, I ask do we face an emergency now?  
29 Is the Metropolitan municipality at a crisis point? Well,  
30 I answer it here for you only in general terms by asking







1 again can we fool with the future as it were of existing  
2 children, and a point that is well made often in our  
3 meetings is that the children are here now. Many types  
4 of structures can wait, but schools really should not.  
5 You might say are the children suffering at the present  
6 time? I am pointing out they are certainly all getting  
7 the bare essentials.

8           There have been very definite articles in  
9 the press which have drawn attention to the different  
10 facilities available in our different municipalities  
11 according to the willingness, but more according to the  
12 ability of the children's parents to pay for educational  
13 facilities; such things as assembly halls where more is  
14 learned in the school than the mere conning of texts  
15 books, and libraries where habits which will form a  
16 lifetime background for intellectual activity are lacking  
17 from some sections of this area. Special teaching for  
18 specially needing children - I don't mean "needy" but  
19 needing children is again more prevalent in some parts  
20 of the municipality than in others although by and large  
21 it is paid for in its operating cost by the Metropolitan  
22 area as a whole. The larger areas to some extent have  
23 had more imagination, however, in introducing this type  
24 of class because it had larger numbers of children who  
25 demand special treatment.

26           We will have a great many children shall we  
27 say half housed. There are fifteen thousand children  
28 today at school, I suppose at this moment if they are  
29 well behaved, at school in portable frame structures heated  
30 by noisy oil furnaces. This is not going to ruin a





1 child's character, but it is not what we really expect  
2 in education today.

3           Fifteen thousand children is the equivalent  
4 of all the high school children of one of the major  
5 municipalities; Toronto and North York have about that  
6 enrollment in their secondary schools, and there are  
7 about five hundred of these classes with thirty children  
8 in each still in use here.

9           Another emergency now is that many trustees  
10 on the Metro Board are occasionally in a new kind of  
11 dilemma: should we try to make the Metropolitan School  
12 Board work or would it really be a patriotic thing, for  
13 instance, to cut back on the maintenance assistance  
14 payments and wreck the Board with the intention that  
15 somebody should come along and reform it. This is not  
16 a feeling that we had five and six years ago, but as  
17 things have become more strenuous the question has been  
18 seriously asked by thinking trustees: Is patch work  
19 a good idea or would it be better to bring dramatically  
20 to the attention of the public the weaknesses of the  
21 system which is now operating?

22           Another thing that confronts us, must we  
23 continue to operate what seems to be a charitable  
24 organization? Boards which have found themselves in  
25 desperate straits have sometimes asked, sometimes begged  
26 and sometimes threatened the school board for aid. They  
27 have known that under the legislation aid to these  
28 boards would have to be widely distributed, and this  
29 has put Metropolitan trustees in another of their  
30 difficult situations. Nobody likes dispensing charity.







1 Perhaps the only more difficult thing than collecting  
2 money is to give it away, and we have not enjoyed it and  
3 don't even like being thanked although you appreciate it  
4 when other municipality boards sometimes formally and  
5 sometimes informally express their thanks to the Metro-  
6 politan Board for its interest in the outlying sections.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: What do you mean by  
8 "charity"?

9 MR. DAVIDSON: I think, sir, it is this:  
10 in the dormitory areas where the school costs while  
11 low are complicated by a vast number of people  
12 going to school. They would have to beg the Metropolitan  
13 School Board to raise the maintenance assistance payments  
14 pretty well on these grounds: "If you don't we are  
15 going to have to cease conducting regular maintenance of  
16 our buildings." They have not said that, but they  
17 would mean "if you don't increase these payments we are  
18 going to have to pack more children into our classrooms",  
19 thereby saving on the per child cost of paying the  
20 teacher.

21 We have the feeling, particularly the ten  
22 members of the Board of Education in the City of Toronto  
23 who sit on the Metropolitan School Board, that it is  
24 really a question how much could we afford to take from  
25 the pockets of the City of Toronto taxpayer and contri-  
26 bute to the real needs of the suburban taxpayer.

27 Now, "charitable" may be too strong a word,  
28 but that is the point I am trying to make.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I am amazed that  
30 you use the word "charity" because I do not think it





1 applies at all.

2 MR. DAVIDSON: I don't think it should apply.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think that  
4 trustees should feel that way. You started out by  
5 reading from the report of the Ontario Municipal Board  
6 which said that the combined resources of the entire  
7 area are to be made available to support education. Now,  
8 certainly when the Board said that it was not thinking  
9 of the rich giving charity to the poor.

10 MR. DAVIDSON: I would agree.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: It is a case of using  
12 the resources of the entire area for the benefit of the  
13 entire area, and I am really amazed that you use that  
14 term "charity" or tell me that some of the trustees  
15 think that by increasing maintenance assistance payments  
16 that they are making charitable contributions.

17 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. Well, I think "charity"  
18 is, sir, I will fully agree a strong word. I think  
19 when I come to the next point here perhaps you will see  
20 why I used it. Meanwhile may I suggest that the  
21 quotation which I read from - and I may say which I  
22 live by at some peril to my life - the quotation was a  
23 statement of intention, and that the legislation which  
24 was passed largely as a result of this representation  
25 on the part of Mr. Cumming did not embody the recommen-  
26 dation that the financial resources become totally  
27 available, and the main proposal of the brief we have  
28 before you, which is that we should completely recommend  
29 that there should be a uniform tax rate, does in fact  
30 embody this, and it is to escape from this situation





1 where we feel we are dispensing one man's money to  
2 another on an arbitrary basis that we are anxious to  
3 have reforms recommended.

4           The last point I would like to suggest is  
5 that because of this relationship which has been blown  
6 up in the press and in the political councils of recent  
7 days, we are I think in danger of destroying the  
8 harmonious relationship by and large which has character-  
9 ized the situation for a hundred years between the  
10 municipal organization and the municipal educational  
11 organization.     There has been of recent years, as you  
12 would be fully aware, many representations; one note-  
13 worthy one from the Association of Mayors and Reeves,  
14 suggesting that education be a committee of the Council  
15 or that the Board of Education if not consisting of  
16 Council members be under strict financial review by a  
17 council.

18           Now, in our explorations of the workings of  
19 other countries and of sections of this country and in  
20 the United States, we do not find that a unified  
21 electoral control of education has contributed to the  
22 mass spread of education.     English education as we  
23 all admit willingly produced the very finest products  
24 in the case of those who can get enough of it, but those  
25 who have visited England and who have taken children to  
26 England - I have not been in that position - but those  
27 who have taken children to England have had the greatest  
28 difficulty literally in finding anywhere to send them to  
29 school, and many of the parents in England are frightfully  
30 unhappy about the plight they are in at the conclusion







1 of the eleventh year of the child's life or about the  
2 sixth year of his education simply because any land  
3 where separately elected boards of education do not  
4 exist has just quantitatively not put enough into the  
5 development of school buildings.

6 I visited a city in the United States,  
7 Pittsburgh, on one occasion where I found the tax rate  
8 was limited by decree of the State Legislature. They  
9 had in one case found a good way of economizing to meet  
10 this. The principals were given three schools each and  
11 a car, which they circulated between. They were paid  
12 on a per room basis so they could give them a little  
13 wage as long as they looked after the affairs of three  
14 schools.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: It would have been  
16 cheaper to give them a bicycle.

17 MR. DAVIDSON: It would have kept them out  
18 of trouble. Now, we have I should say been suffering  
19 if one suffers when one reads the paper. Not many of  
20 us have time to attend Council meetings where these  
21 things are alleged to have been said, but we have been  
22 told that we have thrown away our birthright; that we  
23 are robbing the taxpayer of the City of Toronto to  
24 benefit those people unworthy on the outskirts who were  
25 unwise enough not to have taken the Bank of Commerce  
26 Building with them when they moved outside the City  
27 Limits. This goes on.

28 I would not like this to become so pro-  
29 nounced that the whole relationship between education  
30 and municipal government in other matters should be





1 altered.

2 Now, the members of this Board, as I told  
3 you at the beginning there, have not suggested that  
4 there is an easy way out. Our proposed solutions are  
5 before you in the green book. We do not feel that our  
6 primary purpose is to tell you what solution you should  
7 produce, but we do feel that being people who have  
8 devoted a great many hours and in many cases years to  
9 this problem that we would be derelict in not presenting  
10 what we think would be helpful solutions.

11 As you look at the cover of the brief before  
12 you - I would say this perhaps for the benefit of  
13 visitors if I may, if that is not improper - you see the  
14 outline of the "Eleven" system, the four-borough system,  
15 and unity suggested by the artist who designed the cover.  
16 There is no suggestion that we are heading downward  
17 towards unity or upwards towards the eleven. This is an  
18 artistic conception which appeared before us and pleased  
19 us.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: You are not afraid that  
21 symbol for unity looks like a blank?

22 MR. DAVIDSON: I was hoping it would look  
23 more like a target, sir. We stress in our solutions,  
24 and I am only going to mention two of them that are  
25 printed here at the moment. One, the oneness of the  
26 needs of the whole area. There is a theory that  
27 difficult and expensive to educate / are chiefly in the  
28 older sections of the inner city. This is not entirely  
29 correct. It is true that there are a great many  
30 children who can be educated under a more or less  
standard pattern in the suburban regions.







1                   It is true that the instance of foreign  
2 language which makes a technical problem in addition to  
3 the other ones is greater in the interior of a city,  
4 but a child can be lost, frightened, bewildered and  
5 psychologically displaced if he lives in the suburbs  
6 just as much as if he lives in the centre of Toronto and  
7 he gets more if not better psychological service in the  
8 larger and older systems, it is our belief.

9                   So we do suggest to you that unity of pur-  
10 pose, unity of need exists in the whole area. Secondly,  
11 in order to serve the need we suggest that there is a  
12 real desirability of a fair, equal, financial - now I  
13 had the word "sacrifice" down here and crossed it out  
14 a few times and re-wrote it, but after your comments,  
15 sir, on "charitable" I will just skip it as if I had  
16 not said it and say a fair, equal financial investment  
17 in the future of our country on the part of all tax-  
18 payers throughout the area. It is for this reason that  
19 we advocate a uniform single tax - that the tax be  
20 single, that there be no considerations that a particular  
21 improvement in a particular school is going to hit a  
22 particular group of ratepayers harder than another group,  
23 and we think that if that is embodied in the solutions  
24 proposed for our problems a great advance will have been  
25 made.

26                   You will see there are other and slightly  
27 more detailed recommendations here. There is no sense  
28 going into complete detail. That had in any case been  
29 done in this other study which I know you have seen.

30                   THE COMMISSIONER: Which I have read.





1 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. I am sure you have,  
2 sir.

3 This completes the general remarks which I  
4 have to say. I have marked spots in the brief where I  
5 think there are significant comments and I am sure that  
6 you also have spots where you wish to question us about  
7 the brief. Would it be your wish that we proceed into  
8 the brief? I think perhaps I might like to ask my  
9 vice-chairman just to say a word before we do, for this  
10 reason. In the Metropolitan School Board by by-law the  
11 chairman is elected in alternate years in the City of  
12 Toronto and then from the outside regions so that in a  
13 sense we have co-chairmen. Mr. Parker represents the  
14 other parts of the area. I represent the City of  
15 Toronto. May I call upon Mr. Parker?

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

17 MR. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Davidson.

18 Mr. Commissioner, I wish to express apprec-  
19 iation for having an opportunity to speak inasmuch as  
20 there was never any thought of a minority report being  
21 submitted. It is quite evident this morning that it  
22 is unnecessary for me to say anything. Mr. Davidson  
23 was, as chairman of the Board, expected to (and has quite  
24 ably done so) make our presentation. In alternate  
25 years the Board does have a suburban chairman and a  
26 Toronto chairman and in the alternate years the vice-  
27 chairman does occupy these places.

28 I am most happy to point out that both the  
29 City of Toronto and the suburban trustees were to a  
30 large degree able to support the presentation that is





1 being made here today. In supporting the brief, which  
2 has set forth conditions as they relate to education in  
3 Metropolitan Toronto but has avoided a single categorical  
4 recommendation with respect to future organization, the  
5 suburban trustees would be most reluctant to see all  
6 educational administration and policy-making vested in a  
7 central board.

8 Our success, particularly in the three large  
9 expanding townships where it has been necessary to cope  
10 with phenomenal growth, points up the advantage of having  
11 both lay and administrative people contributing to the  
12 solution of those problems which are pertinent to their  
13 own area.

14 Suburban trustees are able to support the  
15 brief because we feel that consolidation of finance  
16 does not necessarily preclude continuation of strong  
17 area boards working in association with locally based  
18 officials in the day-to-day management of the schools  
19 of the area. While there is a real need for Metro-wide  
20 policy on many matters, most of the day-to-day admini-  
21 strative decisions are best made by people closer to the  
22 scene than a central board could be.

23 We support therefore a closely knit borough  
24 system in which there will be a clear delineation of  
25 function between the borough boards and the central  
26 board and every effort made to provide substantial  
27 administrative and professional freedom at the borough  
28 level.

29 I might say in passing, a personal comment,  
30 that with regard to a statement made by our Chairman this







1 morning I think there has been one mistaken concept  
2 developed by members of the City of Toronto. That is  
3 that the various actions taken which resulted in  
4 financial burdens being placed in areas that they felt  
5 it was their board that was making this imposition,  
6 whereas in fact under the powers which established the  
7 Metropolitan School Board it was the Metropolitan School  
8 Board which was determining what the levies and what the  
9 financial arrangements should be. I do feel that this  
10 is one area where possibly the personal or the strictly  
11 parochial viewpoint has to a degree interfered with the  
12 operation of the Metropolitan School Board.

13 Thank you, sir.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

15 Mr. Davidson, you were going to go on to com-  
16 ment on some particular sections.

17 MR. DAVIDSON: I had marked certain parts.  
18 I do not know if this is an imposition upon you for us to  
19 suggest there are parts which should not be missed ---

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You feel free to go ahead.  
21 I have read this brief twice and have annotated it and  
22 I have some questions for you, but if you want to draw  
23 my attention to particular sections, please do so.

24 MR. DAVIDSON: Shall we just proceed through  
25 it and if you would ask your questions I will answer or  
26 I could call one of my colleagues?

27 THE COMMISSIONER: If you start from the  
28 beginning I can ask you questions as you go along and  
29 you may call on anyone to answer if you choose to do so.

30 MR. DAVIDSON: There is a comment, sir, on





1 page 6 in the centre about the double standard, one  
2 which was recognized, shall we say, prior to World  
3 War II in which the schools of the suburban municipalities  
4 really accepted quite willingly the fact that they would  
5 act as a training grounds for the City of Toronto schools.  
6 This has been something that has been hard for the City  
7 to get over - the idea it had to do its own teacher  
8 training in its classrooms. For years there was a  
9 tradition that two years in the sticks qualified you to  
10 write a letter to the Toronto Board. This is now a  
11 matter of the past and our building, which you have  
12 visited, indicates to you that we feel there is a lot  
13 to be done for teachers after they have started work.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: The sticks are no  
15 longer the sticks.

16 MR. DAVIDSON: The sticks are no longer  
17 the sticks. What has really broken this double standard  
18 as much as anything else is the degree of unity amongst  
19 teachers in which they have insisted on their rights.  
20 They have been more than willing to increase the supply  
21 of teachers but fate has limited their numbers and as a  
22 result in order to get any teachers at all you have to  
23 pay excellent salaries. Therefore the suburban municipi-  
24 palities have been taking it out of the taxpayers rather  
25 than the teachers, shall we say, perhaps in the last ten  
26 years.

27 On page 10 there is, I think, really the  
28 most vivid sentence in the report: "A mill increase in  
29 the Township of Scarborough would yield \$9.50 per pupil;  
30 the same mill would yield \$25.90 in Toronto, \$38.10 in







1 Forest Hill and \$43.50 in Leaside."

2 One might ask how this can be. It is the  
3 case. It is said to have affected real estate values.  
4 People will pay more for a house in Leaside realizing  
5 that they would later have to pay less in taxes. Houses  
6 on opposite sides of the same street where a municipal  
7 boundary line lies are said to command prices which vary  
8 for this reason. But in looking back on these earlier  
9 reports I notice it used to be \$9.60 in Scarborough over  
10 less than \$43.50 in Leaside. This gap is getting wider  
11 not narrower at the present time as housing developments  
12 continue.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: How would one uniform  
14 mill rate solve this problem?

15 MR. DAVIDSON: I think it would mean, sir,  
16 that the money would be raised. It certainly is going  
17 to hit Toronto, Forest Hill and Leaside. Any form of  
18 reorganization in my opinion of the Metropolitan system  
19 is going to hit a municipality which has a high assess-  
20 ment.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Exactly. That is the  
22 point I wanted to draw to your attention when you used  
23 the word "charity" earlier. Even under an amalgamated  
24 system would it not be the ratepayers in the City of  
25 Toronto who would still be paying by far the larger  
26 share for the outside municipalities?

27 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir. There is no  
28 question than that it would. I think the difference  
29 would be that the discretionary power of the ten Toronto  
30 members who are in a dual capacity on the Metropolitan





1 School Board would no longer exist and that when it was  
2 decided that it was necessary to increase the size of a  
3 school or add an assembly hall to an existing school in  
4 the Township of Scarborough, when this decision is made  
5 there would be no act of personally taking the money out  
6 of the pockets of the people of one municipality and  
7 contributing it to the children of the other. This I  
8 do not like.

9 When I used the word "charity" it was only  
10 to indicate I am not in favour of it. Certainly if you  
11 read the members and listen to the elected members who  
12 are not on school boards this word is very frequently  
13 thought of if not expressed in that precise semantic term.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: In Table 1 on page 9  
15 where you present figures of assessment per pupil I am a  
16 little bewildered when I read these figures. For  
17 example your last column would indicate that the assess-  
18 ment per pupil in Forest Hill is below average. Does  
19 this indicate that Forest Hill is a "have not" municipality?

20 MR. DAVIDSON: No, sir. Forest Hill is in a  
21 peculiar position. I believe I am correct in saying  
22 that half the inhabitants live in apartment houses,  
23 which means you get a lot of assessment on the land and  
24 not a very high proportion of children. They do not have  
25 the children to educate. Although their assessment may  
26 not be tremendously high they are in a position whereby  
27 their expenses for schools are not so high.

28 I wonder if there is a possibility here -  
29 Forest Hill's total is the sum of 38,000 and 57,000,  
30 which is 95,000, and the average is the sum of 18 and 57,





1 which is 75. So if Forest Hill is indeed above the  
2 average it is because there is a division in the centre  
3 of the page between public and secondary education.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I am sorry: I meant the  
5 secondary.

6 MR. DAVIDSON: There the Forest Hill assess-  
7 ment appears to be 38,100.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I am sorry; we are not  
9 looking at the same figures.

10 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, I see.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: I see a figure for  
12 Forest Hill 51,500 as compared with the weighted average  
13 of 57,100.

14 MR. DAVIDSON: Sorry; I was looking at the  
15 public and then at the total of the two. There are no  
16 factories in Forest Hill to speak of. This is what  
17 brings their assessment down.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I know that, but when a  
19 figure like this is presented to someone who does not  
20 examine the situation..... You are suggesting that  
21 Forest Hill is one of the "have not" municipalities inso-  
22 far as its capacity to support secondary schools are  
23 concerned.

24 MR. DAVIDSON: In its total capacity, but  
25 because of the fact that so many of the residents there  
26 are apartment residents the number of students who choose  
27 to attend its secondary schools is relatively small. In  
28 other words there are not many children in Forest Hill  
29 and as a result the Village of Forest Hill finds it  
30 relatively easy to educate those children from the fin-







1 ancial point of view.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I was wondering if Mr.  
3 McCordic would have anything to say on this figure?

4 MR. McCORDIC: Mr. Commissioner, from the  
5 beginning the percentage of the school age children who  
6 would normally attend secondary schools has been higher  
7 in Forest Hill.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what their brief  
9 tells me.

10 MR. McCORDIC: When you use as your divisor  
11 the number of pupils we have a high figure because they  
12 have high proportions of their children of this age  
13 actually enrolled in school. Oddly enough if you look  
14 at the other table, as you likely have, you will know  
15 with the respect to the secondary school count this  
16 fact is recognized. In the first two or three years  
17 Forest Hill was in our parlance the gainer with respect  
18 to secondary schools but not with respect to elementary  
19 schools.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that just?

21 MR. DAVIDSON: Does that constitute justice?

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I wonder if there is not  
23 something deceptive about the interpretation of this  
24 figure?

25 MR. McCORDIC: I think not.

26 MR. DAVIDSON: I think the apartment house  
27 situation means they will have a greater number in  
28 secondary schools proportionately than public schools.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Allright; go ahead, Mr.  
30 Davidson.





1 MR. DAVIDSON: Table 2 on page 10, Mr.  
2 Commissioner, indicates the divergencies in spending on  
3 education. This has aroused a good deal of comment  
4 around the Council tables of the Metropolitan Boards and  
5 in the press. How is possible to pay \$363.00 per  
6 pupil in Scarborough for public elementary education and  
7 yet have it cost \$570.00 to do the same thing in Forest  
8 Hill? And is the education in Scarborough of an equal  
9 state of efficiency uplift to that which is found in  
10 Forest Hill?

11 Mr. McCordic has made tours and he gave me  
12 permission to tell you this. He has made tours of the  
13 municipality and discovered that each one of the eleven  
14 municipalities quite sincerely believes the best form of  
15 education is the one offered in that municipality.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what they are all  
17 telling me.

18 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. These figures indicate  
19 that either there is a degree of "extraneousness" (which  
20 I hope nobody would ever remember the word afterwards)  
21 shall we say even in municipal life. To me it is unbel-  
22 ievable and incomprehensible. Either there is such a  
23 degree of "extraneousness" or else they just are not  
24 right.

25 I think the conclusion is what you do not  
26 have you do not miss.

27 Many pupils in some municipalities are put  
28 into slots that do not rightly fit them. They probably  
29 do not know it. Their parents do not complain. The  
30 pupils do not complain. You can, if you are very pupil







1 conscious - as indeed they are in the Village of Forest  
2 Hill - spend more by doing special things for special  
3 people. That is one of the items which enters into it.  
4 Of course, it is true that a smaller municipality may  
5 have a higher expense rate simply because it is small.

6 On the opposite page, number 11, appears the  
7 fantastic table indicating that tax rate and expenditure  
8 per pupil do in fact have very little relationship. It  
9 was certainly the idea of the original report and  
10 legislation that if you were going to have education  
11 above average in the whole Metropolitan municipality  
12 you would have to pay for it through your tax rate; if  
13 you were going to spend more, the tax rate would go up.  
14 But this has not been the case and on this we can blame  
15 assessment - varying assessment and the fact that the  
16 proportion of children going to school differs in different  
17 places.

18 On page 13 in the centre there is a short  
19 paragraph which summarizes this chapter by saying: "The  
20 recommendations of the Ontario Municipal Board with  
21 respect to equalization of schools costs have not been  
22 operative during the past ten years." It just has not  
23 worked.

24 The fact that we are in business is attributed,  
25 I believe, to my fellow members of the Metropolitan  
26 School Board who have suffered long and have really  
27 seen beyond the ends of their noses on almost every pos-  
28 sible occasion and have certainly adopted the policy of  
29 making it work rather than creating a wreck and a  
30 demonstration of our troubles.





Davidson

1 THE COMMISSIONER: You talk of  
2 equalization of school costs in that paragraph. Surely  
3 you did not mean the per pupil cost would be exactly  
4 the same rate throughout the area, in every part, in  
5 every school in the area?

6 MR. DAVIDSON: Certainly not in every  
7 school. I think this would be always impossible but  
8 we do feel that the equalization of systems should be  
9 greater than it is. I think what it really means is  
10 resulting costs to the ratepayer. This perhaps means  
11 that the resulting cost to the ratepayer after providing  
12 for education, rather than the exact amount spent on  
13 each pupil.

14 Now I would ask you to notice on page 16  
15 that we form two conclusions. After presenting this  
16 report and the report on the single mill rate, which  
17 is bound in a fawn cover, if you have one --

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I have read all  
19 of these reports.

20 MR. DAVIDSON: That report, sir,  
21 indicated that we thought there should either be a  
22 uniform tax rate or a foundation programme and there  
23 should be fewer jurisdictions more nearly equal in size.  
24 These are the conclusions of the brief.

25 These conclusions, therefore, were not  
26 hastily thought up. I would like to say a word about  
27 the foundation programme. I do have the feeling that  
28 the foundation programme in an era of inflation, which  
29 seems to be permanently ahead of us, will inevitably  
30 result in the foundation itself becoming what you call a







1 slum and the superstructure for the foundation becoming  
2 the normal standard of living and someone therefore  
3 is going to be left at the bottom.

4 On page 19 of the brief is indicated  
5 the original provisions of the Act which were repealed  
6 in 1958. This is in the middle of page 19: "That  
7 debt arising from site purchase and school construction  
8 up to a basic standard should be assumed by the  
9 Metropolitan Corporation. The Report implied as well  
10 that there would be additional debentures available to  
11 areas desiring to erect buildings beyond this basic  
12 standard."

13 The standard originally was the  
14 provincial grant structure. It soon became apparent  
15 this was just a formula and not a realistic assessment  
16 and this was appealed in 1958 and has been taken over  
17 100% this year.

18 Now I think the next point is on page  
19 24.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: By the way, when  
21 you talk about the assumption of debt by the Metropolitan  
22 School Board you don't really mean the School Board,  
23 you mean the Council? The Board itself doesn't.

24 MR. DAVIDSON: The Board itself does  
25 not issue debentures.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: It is Council on  
27 behalf of the School Board.

28 MR. DAVIDSON: The Council has been  
29 extremely cooperative in doing this. They accept our  
30 lump amount. They have not asked us on what schools it







1 is going to be spent. They have allowed us to make  
2 adjustments during the year and have never taken each  
3 individual school building and subjected it to debate  
4 on the floor of the Council, which would have been  
5 time-consuming and frustrating and in the end greatly  
6 raise the cost of education. We have a formula which  
7 seems to be acceptable.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Council has agreed  
9 to assume the school debt up to the ceiling cost formula  
10 as from the beginning of this year?

11 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: The Joint Committee  
13 of Council and the Board, as I recall it, recommended  
14 that the debt contracted between 1954 and 1964 should  
15 also be assumed. Is that right?

16 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: That has not been  
18 implemented?

19 MR. DAVIDSON: No. That would have  
20 required provincial legislation and it would follow  
21 in the light of your forthcoming recommendations it  
22 would be premature to ask for that.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you estimated  
24 what the financial effect would be on the individual  
25 School Board if that recommendation were implemented?

26 MR. DAVIDSON: I think there is a table  
27 in the Appendix of this Report on page 65. Is that the  
28 right one, Mr. McCordic?

29 MR. McCORDIC: That is right, sir.

30 MR. DAVIDSON: I wonder if you would





1 care to explain the table on page 65?

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I have seen that  
3 table. I will ask one question about it. Did this  
4 take into account the assumption of the debt for those  
5 ten years by the Metropolitan Council?

6 MR. McCORDIC: That is right, Mr.  
7 Commissioner.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: The net result is  
9 not very great.

10 MR. McCORDIC: That is right, sir.  
11 Actually what the Board has done will effect mill rates  
12 this year hardly at all because the debt will be a new  
13 debt and the first charges will fall due next year.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: You are sure that  
15 this table on page 65 makes allowance for the assumption  
16 of the ten years debt which has not been assumed?

17 MR. McCORDIC: That is right, sir.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I was under the  
19 impression that was excluded.

20 MR. DAVIDSON: The reason the differences  
21 are not very great is principally that the City of  
22 Toronto and York Township and other older municipalities  
23 have been renewing schools and the others have been building  
24 new ones.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You are going to  
26 make allowances from the beginning of this year for the  
27 cost of rehabilitation too, are you not?

28 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Which is another  
30 change which will benefit the City of Toronto?







1 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, indeed it will,  
2 but the City of Toronto while it has had an expansion  
3 problem in that there is a greater percentage of the  
4 population going to school, it has not had the  
5 exaggeration of population.

6 Now on pages 24, 25 and 26 is  
7 presented the information which indicates the falling  
8 level of maintenance assistance payments which has  
9 been rescued only this year in 1964 and has occasioned  
10 the greatest amount of political comment. You won't  
11 mind me, I know, referring to the political situation  
12 because we think it is a good word and this is what  
13 it is all about.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: It is part of the  
15 picture.

16 MR. DAVIDSON: There has been the  
17 greatest amount of comment from politicians and even  
18 the Metropolitan School Board members have stood on  
19 a so-called pillory.

20 Now on page 27 we have a brief  
21 paragraph: "An honest effort was made, nonetheless,  
22 to make the Maintenance Assistance Payment Plan work.  
23 Legislation was secured to overcome two fundamental  
24 weaknesses in the original Act."

25 I don't think we need to go into what  
26 the legislation was. We had not split commercial and  
27 technical school originally.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: The Maintenance  
29 Assistance Payment was raised from \$2.05 to \$2.25, was  
30 it not?





1 MR. DAVIDSON: It was beyond that in  
2 the end, \$2.50, I think. It was really substantially  
3 raised but other ones were at the 60% level but the  
4 public school had fallen behind.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know  
6 whether you sent us figures as to the financial effects  
7 of these increases, the anticipated financial effects.

8 MR. McCORDIC: I understand we did,  
9 sir.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I haven't seen  
11 that.

12 MR. DAVIDSON: The point I was going  
13 to make is at the bottom of page 28. It refers to the  
14 earlier schemes we had explored. I would like to stress  
15 that if mathematics could have solved our problems  
16 they would have done so and our future lies in the  
17 field of mathematics plus legislation. What we really  
18 need is, of course, differential legislation so you  
19 can give to those who need it and withhold from those  
20 who don't. It is so hard in municipal affairs to devise  
21 any kind of formula that will do that. I want to get away  
22 from the feeling that we must do it from our hearts  
23 entirely so that we think that the single tax is the  
24 answer to this.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You know that the  
26 basic principle of the Federal - Provincial financial  
27 arrangements is represented by the equalization payments?

28 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. This, of course,  
29 is done on an actuarial basis to begin with. I don't  
30 know whether it is carried through to the bitter end on





1 that basis.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: There is no  
3 actuarial basis for it but that is the principle you  
4 are talking about.

5 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes. This is what we  
6 would like. We don't feel it can be done.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Why?

8 MR. DAVIDSON: Well, this is a matter  
9 of negotiation between groups of people who are really  
10 pretty discreet in the different Provinces of the  
11 country.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You said it couldn't  
13 be done locally. Is that what you mean?

14 MR. DAVIDSON: The difference is you  
15 really have not got discreet situations. I feel strongly  
16 looking at Toronto sociologically it is possible to  
17 distinguish between the central core and the outskirts  
18 as a whole. It is only possible on the basis of  
19 assessment to distinguish one suburban area from another.  
20 There is nothing of a phenomenon about it. There is not  
21 too much history about it. I don't think people of one  
22 area are fundamentally different from people of another.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Is there not a  
24 relationship between provincial grants and local  
25 assessments for educational purposes?

26 MR. DAVIDSON: The provincial grants  
27 accrue entirely to the Metropolitan School Board since  
28 1954.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: I am talking of the  
30 general principle.







1 MR. DAVIDSON: Throughout the Province,  
2 yes, there is.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: They are related as  
4 they are in other Provinces. They are related to  
5 assessment on an inverse ratio to assessment.

6 MR. DAVIDSON: I wonder if I could  
7 call on Trustee Coutts to make a comment?

8 PROFESSOR COUTTS: I don't know what  
9 comment to make except I feel the provincial grant  
10 structure is not overwhelmingly satisfactory in that  
11 neither the poor who get larger grants and the rich  
12 who get smaller grants seem to be happy with it.

13 I don't know just what Mr. Davidson  
14 wants me to say. My own feeling is that unless it is  
15 done by some kind of formula, and I do think, sir,  
16 that Provincial - Federal statistics do try and tie in  
17 with the gross national product and so on. It is very  
18 difficult to determine. We found it impossible to  
19 measure the things in any such manner. There is no  
20 such thing as per capita income and per capita children  
21 and per capita needs of education. It didn't seem to  
22 be capable of a formula.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: The Federal - Provin-  
24 cial arrangement has got away from the old formula.  
25 It is related to the yield of three particular taxes.  
26 Have you not got that here municipally?

27 PROFESSOR COUTTS: I would like to say  
28 I would be happy if we could avoid the type of problem  
29 that is involved in the Federal - Provincial relations  
30 within the Metropolitan Toronto. I cannot believe they





1 have solved the problem entirely.

2 As Mr. Davidson says we have an  
3 area here that is almost unified in the sense of being  
4 economically and socially one unit and there is constant  
5 negotiation between the areas. The decision should  
6 be made not in reference to some fairly arbitrary  
7 municipal area but in reference to the needs of the  
8 pupil in the school or classroom. This is what we would  
9 like related to a formula.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Thanks.

11 MR. DAVIDSON: Now I would refer to  
12 the bottom of page 30, Mr. Commissioner. As you know  
13 this is a public document and it has been circulated.  
14 These terms "haves" and "have nots" are in here. I would  
15 like to comment that they have never been challenged.  
16 They are agreed to exist by the people who have read  
17 the report and who are the people, I think, interested  
18 in municipal government here. The fact that they have  
19 been printed and printed in quotation marks I think is  
20 quite significant.

21 Then on pages 34 and 35 are a series of  
22 comments and on page 36 the function of trustees and I  
23 think Mr. McCordic really was responsible for this  
24 section and we have to thank him for it as trustee.  
25 He has pointed out that this function, which was originally  
26 merely financial and consisted only in the choice of a  
27 teacher and the provision of a building, has now spread  
28 a long way from there.

29 The Provincial Government still sets  
30 the curriculum and it allows so many optional courses







1 which a municipality may or may not provide and the  
2 field of influence of a trustee has spread itself very  
3 widely.

4                   The reason I call your attention to  
5 this at all is it is asked frequently if there was  
6 either an amalgamated unitary system or a borough  
7 system would the local trustees have anything to do  
8 if they were not primarily responsible for setting  
9 the main budget.

10                   Now we feel they would. We feel  
11 that in acquainting themselves with educational  
12 problems, experiments, needs for equipment and in  
13 interpreting the demands which now come from completely  
14 outside education, for such things as the introduction  
15 of cessation of religious instruction, the introduction  
16 of instruction in the French language, for the return  
17 to the phonetic system of teaching reading and such  
18 other matters which used not to be the concern of the  
19 public at all; we think that the local trustee, apart  
20 from the central trustee, may well have a useful and  
21 satisfying job.

22                   He would lose probably the right to  
23 assess arbitrarily taxes. He would have to make his  
24 plea for financial support to the central authority.  
25 This is not what trustees have been accustomed to do.  
26 It relieves them of one rather embarrassing aspect of  
27 life, it deprives them also of some of their power at  
28 the present time, which is if a thing is needed it can  
29 be obtained.

30                   Starting on page 38 is the section





1 which I would summarize by saying that it is pro  
2 size. This we feel is extremely important that no  
3 unit should be particularly small even under a new  
4 system that is set up.

5                   On pages 42 and up to 45 are set out  
6 some considerations as to what the optimum size of an  
7 educational unit should be. It comes to a conclusion  
8 expressed at the centre of page 45 that 200,000 to 300,000  
9 people probably have enough children to provide a  
10 unit which is viable in the sense it can economically  
11 provide the different aspects of education which are  
12 essential to operation in the interest of the individual  
13 child.

14                   I might say it is a personal opinion  
15 and this has not been discussed. In the smaller system  
16 the individual child has a chance of being treated as  
17 an individual. This, of course, should not be taken  
18 to extremes. The system of one child and one teacher  
19 is ideal for individualism. In the small systems there  
20 are likely to be less different things for children  
21 to do. We have recommended that 200,000 to 300,000  
22 should be the minimum size of an educational unit.

23                   On pages 48 and 49 there is a  
24 reference to exchanging pupils across municipal boundary  
25 lines. This involves the buying and selling of  
26 municipal services. It has worked out extremely well.  
27 It has not worked out in every part of the municipality.  
28 However, the taxpayers were willing to have their  
29 children sent to a school in neighbouring municipalities  
30 which might be physically quite close by; these people







1 have been denied really representation. They have  
2 not had any voice in electing the school trustee who  
3 is running the school which their children attend,  
4 and they can't have any voice short of moving. So  
5 while this has been administratively a good thing, the  
6 spirit of involvement of the trustee with the school  
7 and the parent with the trustee and the school have  
8 suffered. If there are too many units this can go on.

9 I think whatever the size there will  
10 always be some specialized activities which must be  
11 centralized, and we recommend later on in the report  
12 that when this should be the case, and this is on page  
13 55, if I may just jump to page 55 for the moment, that  
14 the new Metropolitan School Board should be admitted  
15 into full partnership with borough educational bodies  
16 in matters of educational planning. At the present  
17 time if people were to say, "What do you do on the  
18 Metropolitan School Board?", we tell them we are  
19 really an approving authority for the building of new  
20 schools and a financial redistribution agency, and  
21 that we have no employees who are engaged in education  
22 directly. We have indeed no teachers or inspectors  
23 or anything of that sort.

24 Now, it is the recommendation of this  
25 report where services are centralized and the cost of  
26 special education is assumed by the Metropolitan School  
27 Board, that the Metropolitan Board, as a Metropolitan  
28 Board, should have some policy direction and probably  
29 have an educational director -- this is not precisely  
30 said -- who would make it possible that the trustees who







1 are paying for the school also be operating it.

2                   At the present time all the Metropolitan  
3 schools are farmed out to particular municipalities,  
4 and while this has worked well, and there is a great  
5 spirit of cooperation and friendship, we think it does  
6 lead to possibilities of separation in the future which  
7 do not at present exist.

8                   THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think that  
9 the Metropolitan Board should have administrative  
10 authority in those fields?

11                   MR. DAVIDSON: We think in the field,  
12 sir, where there is special service granted to children  
13 from various areas that it would be good for the  
14 Metropolitan Board. An example of this on a very  
15 tentative basis is taking place at the moment. The  
16 Toronto Board of Education is considering the establish-  
17 ment of a high school for the performing arts, and has  
18 issued an invitation to trustees from the rest of the  
19 metropolitan area to join in the consultative committee  
20 which is drawing up specifications and ideas for this  
21 school for they realize many of the pupils will come  
22 from places other than the City of Toronto, and they  
23 would like the Metropolitan trustees to be interested  
24 in it from the beginning.

25                   There is no legislative way at the  
26 present time in which these trustees can make binding  
27 decisions, but their voice will be heard; if not,  
28 their vote recorded.

29                   On page 45 are listed certain services  
30 which could be well centralized. I would simply like to





1 say not all these things mean economy, but we feel they  
2 do mean better operation. Some of them are there  
3 specifically for economy and others for improved  
4 efficiency.

5 I do not think the attitude of  
6 school trustees in the metropolitan area of Toronto  
7 either on individual Boards or on the Metropolitan  
8 Board is for a blind economy. I would think we are  
9 trying to advance educationally; but we realize in  
10 this field as in all others, static approach is not  
11 good enough, and where we feel we are going to get  
12 results we are prepared to pay for it. We are not,  
13 however, as you will appreciate, spendthrifts.

14 On pages 51 and 52 we have two  
15 paragraphs of headings A and B which we found  
16 difficult to word. I found myself criticizing the wording  
17 and unable to improve it. We do point out that  
18 if we consolidate we are going to eliminate and absorb  
19 certain systems which have meant a very great deal to  
20 the Metropolitan municipality, and that a real effort  
21 will be made to analyze what it is that these systems  
22 have contributed and see that these essential contri-  
23 butions do not disappear.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me. That  
25 they do not disappear from where?

26 MR. DAVIDSON: From the new system. If,  
27 for instance, the Village of X is absorbed by the  
28 Township of Y, and the Village of X has brought into  
29 education ideas which are really worthwhile, we would  
30 hope absorption would be so gradual that those ideas







1 would spread -- like a drop of water in a lump of sugar  
2 -- and that the invention, the initiative which has  
3 been shown by some of these small areas in the past  
4 will not be lost.

5                   Perhaps you would say this is just a  
6 pious hope, but we think if we begin with this idea  
7 that we are not going to simply sweep away existing  
8 organizations without considering their essential  
9 virtues, we will have a greater chance of preserving  
10 these things than if we say we are going to amalgamate  
11 Y and Z.

12                   THE COMMISSIONER: Take the example  
13 of the Village of X absorbed by the Township of Y.  
14 The Village of X has a progressive school system.  
15 Perhaps I should not use the word "progressive", but  
16 has introduced advanced methods and the Township of Y  
17 has not done so. Would you, under your recommendation,  
18 allow the Village of X to maintain its preferred system?

19                   MR. DAVIDSON: We will hope that the  
20 school, the pupils of the school would hardly know  
21 the difference at the beginning of the new regime.  
22 Schools are, as you would recognize, very individual  
23 affairs. No matter what your organization is you  
24 sometimes cannot persuade the principal anyway, but we  
25 would hope that the features in this area which does  
26 have a certain if not geographic at least a political  
27 context at the moment, we would hope that the schools of  
28 this area would maintain for a long time what they  
29 already had. I do not think you would find Metropolitan  
30 trustees saying: "Well, let's eliminate feature 1 from





1 school X because it has been joined with another Township.  
2 This is all over now."

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting  
4 a uniform rate?

5 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, sir.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: And you are now  
7 saying that with a uniform rate one or two schools  
8 within a consolidated area would be able to retain  
9 preferred services within that area? Is that possible?  
10 Would that be possible?

11 MR. DAVIDSON: We are hoping, of course,  
12 not to pull down but to build up in general.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: But it takes time  
14 to build up.

15 MR. DAVIDSON: This does take a long  
16 time, but I think the kind of things you have in  
17 schools, for instance, if a school is built with class-  
18 rooms of a size and arrangement of a type that suit  
19 certain activities, I can hardly see the fact that these  
20 would be deliberately transposed back for the sake of  
21 saying, "In the interests of equality you chaps are  
22 going to give up eating in a cafeteria here because  
23 we are going to make this into four classrooms."

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't think  
25 the taxpayers in the rest of the consolidated area  
26 would object?

27 MR. DAVIDSON: I don't think they will  
28 object any more than they are objecting now to the  
29 transposition of plain cash from one municipality to  
30 another. That I think makes them most unhappy, and this







1 is going on.

2 Now, in section B we point out that  
3 some of the systems which are large enough to provide  
4 a fully diversified programme on their own could well  
5 be left on their own, but in many cases they will have  
6 to be joined with other systems, but principally, of  
7 course, because of the needs of the other systems.

8 It is quite true,  
9 if new arrangements are made upsetting things --It is  
10 an upset, however, the idea that they can be better  
11 rebuilt.

12 I have already spoken about the  
13 recommendations which appear on pages 54 and 55.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

15 MR. DAVIDSON: I do not need to repeat  
16 them now.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: One of your  
18 recommendations is uniform teachers' salaries. Is that  
19 not right?

20 MR. DAVIDSON: Yes, I believe that is.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: It is on page 67.

22 MR. DAVIDSON: That is in an Appendix,  
23 but I think it can be said because ten of the eleven  
24 area municipalities have expressed themselves at one  
25 time or another, and at one time all ten, on this  
26 subject, that this is a pretty cardinal point. It  
27 certainly to me seems a very important point.

28 We feel that whether or not, and  
29 this recommendation here did not envisage a reorgani-  
30 zation even under the present eleven-municipality system we







1 felt that the teachers' salaries should be equal through-  
2 out any part of the area.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the scales  
4 should be the same?

5 MR. DAVIDSON: The scales should be  
6 the same, yes. The fundamentals were until very  
7 recently completely general so that the teacher should  
8 be paid on the basis of his qualifications, the extent  
9 to which he pursued education for himself, on his  
10 experience, -- roughly speaking full experience comes  
11 now about 17 years after beginning to teach, which  
12 some people think is a bit early -- but that is the  
13 way the scale is worked out. Also his special  
14 responsibilities beyond his work in his own classroom.  
15 If he is a Departmental Head. Certain other features  
16 have been introduced in some parts of the area, and for  
17 good reason.

18 The principle of setting salaries  
19 according to the efficiency of the teacher has always  
20 been very appealing to the taxpayer. More I think to  
21 the taxpayer even than to the parents. It has never  
22 appealed to Teachers' Associations in the past, but at  
23 least in one municipality -- really in more than one  
24 municipality -- certain forms of recognition which do  
25 not involve either experience or qualifications or  
26 responsibility but which are based on excellence have  
27 been incorporated into salary scales. This has intro-  
28 duced an unfortunate competitive feature, and we would  
29 like to see, if that thing were done one place, that it  
30 be regularized everywhere, or if not--and this is I think





1 where a Metropolitan Board would step in--it should  
2 not exist anywhere. We think there are lots of  
3 opportunities for teachers to bring promotion and to  
4 be dealt with by a sympathetic person or Department  
5 for their other needs without having a difference of  
6 salaries within this one municipality which is in any  
7 event to a great extent financially linked. Nobody  
8 would like to say the City of Hamilton and the City  
9 of Toronto should be told to have the same salary.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Insofar as the majority  
11 of your Board I gather prefers a unified system. How  
12 does that differ from the amalgamation recommended by  
13 the Toronto Board of Education?

14 MR. DAVIDSON: Well, the Toronto Board  
15 of Education -- you will be hearing their presentation  
16 of course this afternoon.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I won't have an  
18 opportunity of asking you this question.

19 MR. DAVIDSON: No. The Toronto Board  
20 of Education's structure is obviously designed on the  
21 theory perhaps you might say that this area is not so  
22 big in comparison with the world's really big cities,  
23 that chopping it up is justified. I am speaking a bit  
24 as a member of the Toronto Board now when I say this. I  
25 have certainly read and worked on the brief to some  
26 extent with the Toronto Board.

27 They would feel that to design a new  
28 system at this time and set it up under a unitary  
29 basis would really not step ahead far enough; that if  
30 competition in educational ideas is desirable, that can







1 be obtained by competing with other areas such as the  
2 Hamilton-Burlington area or the Oshawa-Peterborough area,  
3 and that it would be desirable at the present time to  
4 face the fact that this City is still within the size  
5 range that it can have one system of education.

6 Now, the Metropolitan members would  
7 not agree to that. I do not think that even if the  
8 Toronto members had unanimously at the metropolitan  
9 level supported the policy of their own Board, it  
10 could have been done. It probably would have resulted  
11 in some kind of stalemate.

12 This has been a feature of the  
13 Metropolitan School Board, that anything supported  
14 unanimously by Toronto, plus even one of the remaining  
15 ten municipalities would attain that majority vote,  
16 and that anything supported by all the remaining  
17 municipalities could hardly be expected to pass if it  
18 were uniformly opposed by Toronto. We have been very  
19 lucky that that kind of a situation has hardly ever  
20 actually taken place at the Metropolitan School Board.  
21 We usually talk each other into an understanding.

22 The Metropolitan Board, shall we say,  
23 just won't go for this type of unitary operation. They  
24 have gone so far as to suggest that it is a possibility,  
25 but our recommendation calls upon you, sir, to make  
26 this decision.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: When your brief  
28 says that these needs could be met under one amalgamated  
29 Board or under a closely knit federation of borough  
30 Boards, shall I conclude that the amalgamated Board that





1 is mentioned there would be the amalgamated Board  
2 recommended by the Toronto Board of Education or  
3 something like it?

4 MR. DAVIDSON: I don't think it was  
5 quite as clearly set out as that at the Metropolitan  
6 School Board. Certainly something like it would not  
7 be wrong. We can have it -- these various proposals  
8 of this sort, as you know, are in this report on  
9 equalization. I do not think this represents that  
10 Toronto insisted on that phrase and the suburbs insisted  
11 on "closely knit federation". It is simply a statement  
12 that there are two ways in which we could share  
13 responsibility for education. In this municipality  
14 if you could guarantee the municipality would never  
15 change, it would be easier to make a decision.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: A uniform rate  
17 would really call for an almost completely centralized  
18 system, would it not?

19 MR. DAVIDSON: Well, our hope is if  
20 there were a uniform tax rate and a borough system  
21 with representatives from the borough Boards who were  
22 sitting on a central Board, the borough Board having  
23 prepared a budget would bring this budget to the  
24 central Board, and that the consideration of this budget  
25 would not take -- for instance, let us say an outlying  
26 Board had asked for a sharp increase in its local budget.  
27 It would not be subtracting that money in effect from the  
28 core Board only. This would be over. They would  
29 establish the need for the money in their own area. We  
30 hope they could do it efficiently, and once the necessity







1 of raising the money was there, no one Board of the  
2 eleven Boards or no three Boards of the eleven Boards  
3 would feel "We are the ones who are going to make this  
4 contribution". This, I think, is the difference.

5 At the present time if a Board wishes  
6 to do more in an outlying district, they have two  
7 alternatives; one to hit their own taxpayers perhaps  
8 to the point of impossibility. The other is to take it  
9 from the core area, and the core area has one thought  
10 in mind: "How much can I get away with giving these  
11 guys without running into trouble with my own Council?"

12 THE COMMISSIONER: With a uniform tax  
13 rate and a borough system, wouldn't you pretty much  
14 have to have a foundation programme?

15 MR. DAVIDSON: Well, a foundation  
16 programme as defined may or may not indicate a uniform  
17 tax rate. Under a uniform tax rate there would be  
18 no opportunity for the boroughs to assess additional  
19 expenditures in their own boroughs.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I see. You would  
21 not give them the freedom to raise money within their  
22 boroughs for educational purposes?

23 MR. DAVIDSON: No, sir, we would not.  
24 I feel strongly and I think other members of the Board  
25 would probably agree that this is the way to begin a  
26 new series of (to use the vulgar phrase) educational  
27 slums. The area which will not soak its own taxpayers  
28 may in comparison with the other areas become very badly  
29 off. And sometimes the reasons why they will not soak  
30 their own taxpayers would be completely extraneous to







1 education. It may have to do with other municipality  
2 expenditures.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: That completes  
4 my questions.

5 MR. DAVIDSON: I do not know whether  
6 I have robbed any of my colleagues of an opportunity  
7 to express feelings.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: They may do so  
9 if they want to.

10 MR. LOWES: It is hard to follow Mr.  
11 Davidson, Mr. Commissioner, but I would only say briefly  
12 and draw to your attention the things we do agree upon  
13 at a metropolitan level. I think the most agreeable  
14 fact is the fact that this was carried by a 20 to 2 vote,  
15 and immediately after the New Year when there were  
16 new members on the Board. If it had been at another  
17 time of the year it might have even been unanimously  
18 agreed upon.

19 I think the important factor is the  
20 fact that there is almost unanimity on the fact that  
21 there should be some form of consolidation, that these  
22 units should be larger than presently constituted -- and  
23 this has been indicated -- that there should be a  
24 uniform tax rate and that this would envisage a uniform  
25 salary scale. This is probably one of our biggest  
26 problems at the moment.

27 But when you come to it do you do it  
28 with a single monolithic administration or do you do  
29 it under a borough system?

30 I think we agree that it could be done





Lowes

1 either way. The only thing that occurs to me -- and I  
2 think to some of the other people here -- is that where  
3 a trustee does not have fiscal responsibility really  
4 at the regional level, if you call them regional  
5 committees, you have emasculated that committee and  
6 I question whether or not we are going to get men and  
7 women of stature and competence that we are going to  
8 want to serve on a body that only deliberates, recommends  
9 and passes it upstairs. I would think you would in  
10 time degenerate into a glorified Home and School  
11 Association. I think this is a real hazard and something  
12 that you should consider very carefully before making  
13 your decision.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking about  
15 the borough system?

16 MR. LOWES: If it is a borough where  
17 they have fiscal responsibility, but where they only  
18 recommend to a central administration, I think that you  
19 are going to lose the personal aspect and the personal  
20 contact that has been the strength of the various  
21 outlying administrations to date.

22 These strong ones could be maintained  
23 as administrative units under an overall Director in  
24 a borough system, if you wish.

25 MR. DAVIDSON: Mr. Mills?

26 MR. MILLS: I have nothing to add.

27 MR. DAVIDSON: I would beg also to  
28 introduce, Mr. Commissioner, Trustee M. Beach, who has  
29 arrived.

30 Thank you very much, sir, for your very







1 patient listening to this harangue.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

3 I will now call for an adjournment  
4 until two o'clock.

5  
6 ---LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT.

7  
8  
9 ---UPON RESUMING AT 2:15 P.M.

10  
11 SUBMISSION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
12 FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

13 APPEARANCES:

14 MR. W. R. STAINSBY- Chairman of the Board

15 THE REVEREND J. V. MILLS - Vice-Chairman of the  
16 Board

17 MRS. IRENE McBRIEN - Chairman of the Finance Commit-  
tee

18 TRUSTEE E. M. DAVIDSON

19 TRUSTEE BARRY COUTTS

20 TRUSTEE MAYLAND BEACH

21 TRUSTEE BARRY LOWES

22 DOCTOR Z. PHIMISTER - Director

23 MR. DOUGLAS SPRY - Comptroller of Finance

24 MR. DOUGLAS GILMOUR - Solicitor

25 MR. CHARLES FULMAN

26 MR. GRAHAM GORE - Superintendent of Secondary Schools

27 MR. ALAN SWEETMAN - Superintendent of Public Schools

28 TRUSTEE ERNEST JONES

29 TRUSTEE ALEC THOMPSON

30 THE COMMISSIONER: I am sorry; I was





1 unavavoidably delayed, Mr. Stainsby. Are you ready to  
2 proceed?

3 MR. STAINSBY: Yes. Thank you, Mr.  
4 Commissioner.

5 As you know, sir, this brief that we  
6 are presenting to you today did not meet with one  
7 hundred percent approval of our Board, but it had quite  
8 a good majority.

9 Mr. Commissioner, before making a  
10 formal presentation to you, concerning the brief in  
11 support of amalgamation prepared by the Board of  
12 Education for the City of Toronto, I should like to  
13 indicate that it is not my purpose today, nor is it  
14 your desire I am sure, for me to give a page by page  
15 recital of the many facets related to education in the  
16 metropolitan area covered in our brief. The  
17 presentation which I propose to make will cover the  
18 more serious aspects of the brief and conclude with  
19 our recommendations.

20 The conclusions to which we have come  
21 have been formed independently and not in collaboration  
22 or cooperation with any other body. They represent  
23 the majority opinion of the Toronto Trustees of the  
24 Toronto Board.

25 With me today, sir, if I may introduce  
26 them to you, are The Reverend John Mills, Vice-Chairman  
27 of the Board, Mrs. Irene Mc Brien, the Chairman of our  
28 Finance Committee, Trustee Edward Davidson, whom you  
29 met this morning, Trustee Barry Coutts, who also spoke  
30 this morning, Trustee Mayland Beach and Trustee Barry





1 Lowes.

2                   The officials that I have with me  
3 are Doctor Z. Phimister, our Director, Mr. Douglas  
4 Spry, our Comptroller of Finance, Mr. Douglas Gilmour,  
5 our Solicitor, Mr. Charles Fulman, a member of our  
6 staff, Mr. Graham Gore, Superintendent of Secondary  
7 Schools and Mr. Alan Sweetman, Superintendent of Public  
8 Schools.

9                   There is also Ernest Jones, a Trustee  
10 of our Board and Mr. Alec Thompson, who I believe will  
11 be appearing before you later.

12                  Undoubtedly there will be a number  
13 of questions or comments which you may wish to make  
14 in relation to the brief and these officials, sir,  
15 with your permission, will assist me in answering any  
16 inquiries which you may have.

17                  The primary purpose of our brief is  
18 to demonstrate that during the ten years of metropolitan  
19 government in this area it is an accepted fact that  
20 this form of local government organization has solved  
21 some problems; but it has also by its very existence  
22 created new problems not foreseen in 1953.

23                  The Toronto Board of Education has  
24 become increasingly concerned with the financial problems  
25 arising out of a recognized need to provide equality  
26 of educational opportunity within the Municipality of  
27 Metropolitan Toronto. To ensure equality it is  
28 becoming more and more apparent that the costs of  
29 providing education vary in the communities that make up  
30 the metropolitan region. This would be true, for example,







1 in many of the downtown areas of Toronto in comparison  
2 with areas where the residents enjoy a higher economic  
3 status. It seems essential that there must be a central  
4 control of financial spending to ensure the equitable  
5 distribution of the required educational services and  
6 facilities.

7 Recognizing, therefore, that the problem  
8 of providing education within the Metropolitan Toronto  
9 area is mainly one of finance, this Board's Brief states  
10 two basic questions, namely:

11 Can an independent local school board  
12 continue to preserve even limited  
13 autonomy in a large, tightly knit  
urban complex? and

14 Can education up to university level  
15 be effectively administered by a  
single amalgamated board for Metropolitan  
Toronto?

16 This Brief seeks to indicate that within  
17 this context it can be logically concluded that the  
18 creation of a single amalgamated board is the desirable  
19 next step.

20 Today, ten years after the publication  
21 of the original Cumming Report, two key phrases still  
22 indicate the chief pre-occupations of education  
23 authorities:

24 ". . the ever increasing costs of operation . ." and  
25 ". . to find an equitable method of financing capital  
26 and maintenance costs."

27 While it is recongized that the average  
28 taxpayer with children of school age is satisfied to  
29 have varying municipal procedures in the handling of  
30 road building, garbage collection, fire services, etc.,





1 he is sensitive to the educational needs of his  
2 children, and wants and, in effect, demands educational  
3 facilities for his children in the municipality in which  
4 he lives equal to the best in the area.

5 The Brief can be divided into four main  
6 headings:

- 7 1. Inequitable distribution of financial burdens.
- 8 2. Problems of teacher recruitment.
- 9 3. Inequities in implementation of the Metropolitan  
10 principle.
- 11 4. Persisting municipal boundary problems; their  
12 effects on parents and children.

13 I should like to enlarge on these four  
14 major defects, all far reaching in the Metropolitan form  
15 of government so far as education in the metropolitan  
16 area is concerned.

17 Let us examine the financial picture  
18 first:

19 The proportion of the total tax levy  
20 borne by each municipality shows that the City of  
21 Toronto remains by far the largest single source of tax  
22 revenue.

23 Among the top four municipalities --  
24 Toronto, North York Etobicoke, and Scarborough --  
25 Toronto raised by far the largest single sum, i.e. 47%.  
26 The remaining three in the top group together contribute  
27 almost 10% less of the total figure than the City.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Why should not the  
29 City of Toronto contribute the largest proportion? Has  
30 it not the largest assessment?







1 MR. STAINSBY: It has, sir, yes.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it not logical  
3 then that the City of Toronto would make the largest  
4 contribution?

5 MR. STAINSBY: That is right. And as  
6 I go on I think you will find the reason why we have  
7 stressed the point at this moment.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

9 MR. STAINSBY: Yet, it will not be  
10 forgotten that these happen to be the three new,  
11 rapidly developing outer suburbs and that their combined  
12 populations already exceed that of the City.

13 In the Brief it is pointed out that, in  
14 the area of capital expenditure, the suburban boards,  
15 because of the rapid growth, have benefitted heavily in  
16 that most of the new schools and facilities have been  
17 built in their municipalities. Conversely, Toronto had  
18 proportionately a larger number of schools in need of  
19 replacement and renovation than other municipalities.  
20 No Provincial grant is available for rehabilitation of  
21 older schools and grants for replacing buildings may be  
22 reduced if a portion of the existing building is less than  
23 forty years old.

24 The Toronto Brief cites statistics pre-  
25 pared by the Metropolitan School Board on net gains and  
26 losses in current operations by municipalities. These  
27 statistics show that the loss figure for Toronto has  
28 ranged from a low of \$1,547,000 in 1955, to an estimated  
29 high of \$6,745,000 in 1963. In round figures, losses  
30 to Toronto amount to approximately \$40,500,000 since 1954.





1 It should be noted that the City which furnished  
2 these considerable sums had little or no voice in their  
3 ultimate disposal.

4 The metropolitan system of education  
5 based on eleven loosely federated school districts, each  
6 enjoying almost unimpaired autonomy must, sooner or  
7 later, become unmanageable.

#### 8 Teacher Recruitment

9 Take the recruitment of teachers as an  
10 example of the difficulties created for Toronto when the  
11 area boards are employing teaching staff. In the early  
12 days of the new system, and even before 1953, most of the  
13 boards were willing to deal with salary problems  
14 associated with staffing on a co-operative basis. Today,  
15 however, certain boards prefer to apply policies of  
16 their own. These policies amounted to a number of  
17 incentives designed to attract teachers and to maintain  
18 the balance of a future supply of teachers in favour of  
19 these boards. In practical terms, the policy of at least  
20 one board can be judged from a reading of the document  
21 reproduced in Appendix 15, page 33, of this Brief.

22 By a system of salary "incentives" -- the  
23 word should really be "gimmicks" -- the municipality  
24 referred to has managed to create Minor Heads, Assistant  
25 Heads, Associate Heads, Heads, Department Heads, and  
26 Master Heads. Every teacher gets promoted within three  
27 years. After three years as Assistant Head a teacher  
28 employed by the Board referred to in the Brief will be  
29 receiving \$600 more salary annually than his colleague  
30 in the City of Toronto with the same experience and







1 qualifications. The allowance for the position as  
2 Master Head of Department is \$1200 payable on the basis  
3 of \$200 the first year, \$400 the second year, continuing  
4 up to \$1200 in the sixth and each succeeding year. This  
5 allowance is added to the salary and allowance the teacher  
6 receives as Head of a Department. How can Toronto which  
7 has been the foremost leader in making sure that teaching  
8 salaries are among the most desirable, along with other  
9 co-operating boards, continue to recruit staff when some  
10 boards resort to the practices mentioned? Toronto does  
11 not feel that a municipality should be permitted to staff  
12 its schools at the expense of neighbouring municipalities,  
13 particularly when contributions in the form of taxes  
14 from these neighbouring municipalities are used to  
15 increase salaries.

16                   It has always been a set policy of the  
17 Toronto Board not to introduce such devices in its  
18 salary schedule and it has refrained from creating  
19 artificial posts of responsibility. Aside from the  
20 financial disadvantage to Toronto teachers, there are  
21 other disadvantages to teachers working in downtown  
22 Toronto. On the way to work they are obliged to struggle  
23 daily through traffic tangles. The schools in which they  
24 teach may be old buildings in unattractive surroundings  
25 with crowded and makeshift classrooms. They may face an  
26 array of special problems with children from densely  
27 populated areas and from underprivileged families which  
28 cannot afford to live in suburbia.

29                   It seems logical that an integrated edu-  
30 cation authority serving the entire amalgamated Metro-







1 politan area would be able effectively to establish  
2 suitably high standards of pay which would provide  
3 for differences in qualifications, experience and  
4 working conditions.

5 Boundary Problems

6 Let us now turn to boundary problems.  
7 These, of course, are covered in the Brief. Under  
8 provisions of the Metropolitan Act, the Metropolitan  
9 School Board is vested with overriding authority in  
10 regard to attendance areas in order that effective use  
11 may be made of all school accommodation in the Metro-  
12 politan area. Difficulties with this authority were  
13 greatly complicated from the start and still are by  
14 variations among area municipalities in the grouping of  
15 school grades. Some boards favour the traditional  
16 division -- the first eight grades in the elementary  
17 school, the remaining five in secondary school. Some  
18 have the 6-2-5 arrangement; still others prefer the  
19 6-3-4 grouping. We can easily envisage the chaos facing  
20 transferring pupils. As if this were not enough, the  
21 multiplicity of promotion systems as numerous as the  
22 boards themselves is calculated to daunt the most  
23 adaptable pupil.

24 The existing municipal boundaries have  
25 left unsolved a rash of human problems affecting non-  
26 resident pupils which, although seemingly small in  
27 themselves, can bedevil the lives of the persons  
28 concerned. These problems are capable of causing much  
29 mental distress as well as financial hardship. Regu-  
30 lations governing non-residents produce difficult cases,





1 not to say injustices. The Toronto School Board, in the  
2 course of a year, deals with many enquiries from  
3 bewildered and sometimes indignant parents over the  
4 enforcement of regulations, though the enforcement itself  
5 is correct. These problems may seem petty when measured  
6 against pressing educational issues of the day. To the  
7 persons concerned they may loom very large, and be an ever-  
8 present irritant. The Toronto Board feels that the rights  
9 of the individual are paramount and must not be shelved.  
10 In an area the size of Metropolitan Toronto internal  
11 boundary problems are anachronisms, and problems associ-  
12 ated with boundaries will disappear in a unified school  
13 board.

14 In this large Metropolitan Municipality,  
15 technical, commercial and other types of vocational  
16 educational facilities must be provided. Accommodation  
17 and equipment for these types of schools are expensive.  
18 The need for this type of education has been recognized  
19 at the Federal and Provincial levels of government, and  
20 these governments unite to pay the total capital cost  
21 of buildings required for this type of education. An  
22 amalgamated board will permit careful planning of all  
23 school facilities and also permit establishment of  
24 school facilities where the needs are greatest. The  
25 only adequate way to deal with the matter is to rid  
26 ourselves of artificial boundary lines and form this  
27 area into a single unified entity which will be  
28 responsible to every segment of the community.

29 In the Brief will be found references  
30 to special education and research. There are problems







1 associated with these two educational areas. While  
2 they are not of the magnitude of other fields of  
3 education, they are of vital importance to the future  
4 developments of these two spheres of education.

5           It is proper at this time that reference  
6 be made to Chapter XIII of the Brief, entitled,  
7 "Alternatives to Amalgamation". For the reasons  
8 outlined, the Toronto Board takes the position that the  
9 issue of full amalgamation of school boards in this area  
10 should be faced now. In this presentation we have touched  
11 the main arguments which, in the view of the Toronto  
12 Board of Education, support amalgamation of educational  
13 facilities. We shall not attempt at this time to  
14 list every major and minor advantage if amalgamation be  
15 effected. It should be noted, however, that it will be  
16 possible:

17           (a) to effect a modern, long-term approach to the  
18 problem of financing educational needs with a rational  
19 and fair distribution of the weight of taxation which  
20 will not impose intolerable burdens on the local  
21 taxpayer;

22           (b) to effect increased efficiency and economy in  
23 various services of the business administration;

24           (c) To effect a reasonable approach to the question  
25 of salaries of teachers in this area;

26           (d) to effect improvement and expansion of existing  
27 special educational programmes; and

28           (e) to assess requirements of the entire region  
29 so that funds and services can be allocated according  
30 to need.





1 Recommendations

2 For the reasons outlined in the Board's  
3 Brief, the Board of Education recommends:

- 4 1. That educational facilities throughout the area of  
5 what is now Metropolitan Toronto be brought together  
6 under a single new amalgamated Board of Education.  
7 2. That the new amalgamated board replace the present  
8 Metropolitan School Board and the existing area boards.  
9 3. That the new amalgamated board be composed of  
10 elected trustees from each electoral district and that  
11 the Separate School supporters be represented.  
12 4. That, for the purpose of electing trustees, the area  
13 of Metropolitan Toronto be divided into electoral districts  
14 with populations of roughly equal size.

15 Mr. Commissioner, I have a small  
16 addendum here that I think you would probably be  
17 pleased to hear, if I could read it, sir.

18 I should also like to state at this  
19 time that there is no essential difference between the  
20 aims of the Metropolitan School Board and the Toronto  
21 Board of Education. The School Board suggests a strong  
22 central board with fiscal and planning authority, whereas  
23 the Toronto Board is of the view that the planning and  
24 financing of education in the Metropolitan region can  
25 best be achieved by a single board responsible for the  
26 educational interests of the whole of the Metropolitan  
27 area.

28 In support of this view, the problem of  
29 school finance was considered in 1963 by a special  
30 committee representing the Executive Committee of the







1 Metropolitan Council and the Chairman's Committee of the  
2 Metropolitan School Board. The special committee's study  
3 carried two clear interlocked inferences:

4 (i) It demonstrates yet again the growing inability  
5 of area school boards to operate independently,  
6 and,

7 (ii) It leaves no doubt of the increasing dependence  
8 of area boards on the Metropolitan region as a  
9 whole.

10 The evidence offered in our brief  
11 indicates that equalization of financial resources, one  
12 of the main targets of the Cumming Report and of the  
13 partially amalgamated school system set up under Bill 80,  
14 has not been achieved, and the chances of its being  
15 achieved are worsening rather than improving.

16 Perhaps some reference should be made  
17 at this time to the Metropolitan School Board's uniform  
18 tax study. The School Board reached the conclusion that  
19 the only plan which would spread the financial require-  
20 ments equally across the eleven school districts in such  
21 a way as to assure equality of educational opportunity  
22 is through a uniform tax rate. In the view of the  
23 Toronto Board a uniform tax rate would be impracticable  
24 and unworkable unless the general municipal tax rate were  
25 also equalized. To accomplish the desired purpose the  
26 total tax rate would need to be common.

27 We have reached the conclusion that the  
28 problem of financing education is already of such  
29 magnitude that it is threatening to burst through the  
30 bounds of local control and, as stated earlier, it seems







Stainsby

1 reasonable to infer that a Metropolitan system of  
2 education based on eleven loosely federated school  
3 districts, each enjoying almost unimpaired autonomy,  
4 must sooner or later become unmanageable.

5 Thank you. That is my presentation.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1 THE CHAIRMAN: I have a number of questions  
2 I would like to put to you, Mr. Stainsby, unless some of  
3 your associates want to add something at this stage to  
4 what you have already said.

5 MR. STAINSBY: I think that is all, sir.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You opened your remarks,  
7 Mr. Stainsby, with a statement there are very serious  
8 problems facing education in Toronto, particularly  
9 financial problems. Have I heard you correctly that  
10 you suggested ~~these~~ problems were created by Metro?  
11 Am I right, or is that your opinion?

12 MR. STAINSBY: I do not think I just said  
13 exactly that, sir. I think what I did say----

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Your opening remarks,  
15 your opening paragraph. I haven't a copy of what you  
16 read.

17 MR. STAINSBY: Oh, I beg your pardon.  
18 Are you referring to the paragraph, "Primary purpose of  
19 our brief is to demonstrate during ten years....."?

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I am sorry. I see the  
21 sentence to which I was referring. It is in your  
22 second paragraph, and I may have misunderstood you.  
23 You say "it will be sufficient to point out that the  
24 primary purpose of the brief is to demonstrate that  
25 during the ten years of Metropolitan Government in this  
26 area it is an accepted fact that this form of local  
27 government organization has solved some problems, but it  
28 has also, by its very existence, created new problems  
29 not foreseen in 1953."

30 I was wondering how the existence of Metro







1 created the new problems.

2 MR. STAINSBY: I will ask Dr. Phimister  
3 to answer that.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I admit the existence  
5 of problems. Dr. Phimister, would you answer that?

6 DR. PHIMISTER: I think, Mr. Commissioner,  
7 we could cite as one example of the condition which  
8 has arisen because of Metro; we are thinking here of  
9 our condition before Metro, if you like, in the City  
10 of Toronto when we were autonomous. Now we are not  
11 autonomous. We are tied in the Metro situation.  
12 From this arises certain problems.

13 As an example, the matter of salaries has  
14 been mentioned. Under the original arrangements in  
15 Metro, salaries were set co-operatively, and most  
16 boards agreed that they would keep their salaries  
17 within certain bounds. Now, when this has been  
18 violated by certain members or a member we will say  
19 of the Metropolitan community, this then faces the other  
20 members of the community with the choice of going along  
21 with this change, which is a radical change upward, or  
22 to maintain what is considered by the other members to  
23 be a fair situation.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I am acquainted with  
25 that situation, but I just wonder how Metro is the cause  
26 of that. What would have been the situation if there  
27 had been no Metro, if the municipalities and School  
28 Boards had just continued as they were before 1953?

29 DR. PHIMISTER: I think if there had been  
30 no Metro, the municipality which indulges in this





1 practice would not have had the resources to do so.

2 Metro provided the resources which made it possible.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Through maintenance  
4 assistance payments?

5 DR. PHIMISTER: That is right.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the point then?

7 DR. PHIMISTER: That is an example, Mr.  
8 Chairman.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: You know, of course,  
10 Dr. Phimister, and I am sure I don't have to tell you -  
11 I know your reputation in the field of education - that  
12 the problem of school finance is by no means confined  
13 to the City of Toronto or Metropolitan Toronto, and that  
14 it is perhaps the outstanding problem across Canada and  
15 the United States whether there is a Metropolitan  
16 municipality or not. You are aware of that, of course.

17 I already drew your attention, Mr. Stainsby,  
18 to your statement about Toronto remaining the largest  
19 single source of tax revenue, and I ask whether you did  
20 not think that having the largest assessment it would be  
21 normal to expect the City of Toronto to be in that  
22 position to make the largest contribution to the area?

23 MR. STAINSBY: That is very true, sir.  
24 We would like to think with the millions going in that  
25 there was someone in Toronto who had some say in just  
26 how it was spent, or at least prevent it being spent  
27 to our detriment.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Taking capital expendi-  
29 ture by way of example, with Toronto having half the  
30 representation on the Metro School Board, would you not





1 say that Toronto has something to say in capital expendi-  
2 tures?

3 MR. STAINSBY: We have run into very little  
4 difficulty at the Metropolitan level in our capital  
5 expenditures, sir. I think my colleagues from the  
6 other Boards would agree with this, that where the need  
7 has been shown that capital expenditure is necessary, the  
8 Metropolitan Board has investigated, has gone along with  
9 the Board that was asking for it, because they have  
10 made themselves acquainted with the problem and knew  
11 that the need was there, so I do not think that capital  
12 expenditure is really the one that we are referring to.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You say in your brief  
14 that the weight of benefit in the area of capital  
15 expenditure has gone heavily in favour of the suburban  
16 Boards because it is in their municipalities that most  
17 of the new schools and facilities have been built.

18 Would you not have expected that is where  
19 most of the new schools would have been built?

20 MR. STAINSBY: Yes, but these same areas  
21 have not got the same number of schools built probably  
22 before the turn of the century where it may be replacing  
23 or at least modernizing.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: That is really something  
25 you can't blame on Metro. Metro couldn't have  
26 created these municipalities before the turn of the  
27 century.

28 DR. PHIMISTER: It is quite true we would  
29 expect the bulk of the schools to be built where the  
30 people are, but I think this leads us to Toronto's







1 problem which is of increasing importance as you  
2 realize the nature of the City and need for urban  
3 renewal and all that is attendant upon this.

4 In the matter of capital expenditures  
5 Toronto I think you would say has been treated on an  
6 equitable basis as far as capital monies are concerned.  
7 Insofar as our present problem, we have gone along on  
8 a stated policy of spending roughly \$10,000,000.00 a  
9 year, but this problem will be accentuated in the years  
10 to come because of need for urban renewal.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: I agree with you there  
12 was something wrong with the policy which did not make  
13 allowance for capital expenditures on rehabilitation.

14 DR. PHIMISTER: Yes.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I have no hesitation in  
16 saying that. That I believe is now being corrected.

17 DR. PHIMISTER: Yes, I understand there is  
18 something, yes.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: But there was that  
20 period when the City alone was responsible for that.  
21 I think that was wrong. I cannot find any logic in  
22 that, but insofar as the construction of new schools  
23 is concerned, surely if there had been amalgamation those  
24 schools would still have had to be built where the  
25 family lived and where the children lived and required  
26 schooling.

27 REV. MILLS: If I might be permitted to  
28 say something?

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, any member of the  
30 delegation is free with the consent of your Chairman to





1 reply to anything I ask.

2 REV. MILLS: I think the position with  
3 respect to the buildings is that during the first few  
4 years of Metro, and it has been my privilege to be on  
5 Metro not quite as long as Trustee McBrien who has been  
6 on since its beginning, but for a considerable time the  
7 Toronto Board of Education members on the Metropolitan  
8 School Board for at least half of the ten years were  
9 quite willing that in the growth period, a very severe  
10 growth period of Metropolitan Toronto - that is the  
11 suburban membership - that we would underwrite without  
12 too much question their need of new school buildings.

13 There came a time when it was necessary for  
14 us also to have new school buildings, and then it became  
15 evident that it was a burden to the taxpayers of Toronto  
16 who, in addition to paying their rate for building, and  
17 I am speaking now before the capital programme was taken  
18 over entirely by Metro, when it was still appropriated  
19 to the local boards as well, that it became a burden to  
20 our people/<sup>because</sup>not only did they pay their own rate, but at  
21 that time and for some considerable time they were paying  
22 at least 53%, and gradually deteriorating to a lower  
23 percentage of the additional cost of the Metropolitan  
24 family.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: But wouldn't the taxpayer  
26 of Toronto have had to do that even under amalgamation?  
27 The schools would have had to be rehabilitated and other  
28 schools were either built or had to be built?

29 REV. MILLS: I grant you that.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: And the bulk of the







1 assessment is in Toronto.

2 REV. MILLS: Right. Therefore the  
3 equalization factor throughout the entire area would  
4 I would feel have some lessening effect on the burden  
5 of the Toronto person himself or herself because it  
6 would be spread more equitably among the other areas,  
7 and the 47% of the extra cost that they were paying in  
8 addition to their own would, I would submit, not be  
9 that great. Therefore, their burden would be appreciably  
10 less.

11 The other area of possibly not complaint - that  
12 is not the right word, but misconsideration; that is a  
13 peculiar word - is in the balance that certain areas  
14 benefit from the funds that you have mentioned, the  
15 maintenance assistance payments that place certain boards  
16 in a beneficial position to barter against the Toronto  
17 Board of Education for its staff. Now, this is an area  
18 that has grown up because of the beneficial elements  
19 derived from maintenance assistance payment, and this is  
20 an area that causes an uneasiness in the Metropolitan  
21 family. Thank you.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Mark you, Mr. Stainsby, I  
23 am not in any way criticizing Toronto. It certainly  
24 appears to me that Toronto has played this game very  
25 fairly with the whole area insofar as contribution to  
26 capital and operating costs are concerned, but I think  
27 that was the proper thing to do. It was the only thing  
28 to do.

29 MR. STAINSBY: As much as one dislikes it, it  
30 is probably the right thing.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't see why you  
2 should dislike it. Would Toronto have been in a better  
3 position if these families, instead of moving outside  
4 - if you had this enormous population increase within  
5 Toronto, would you not have had to build schools and  
6 incur the increase in costs?

7 MR. STAINSBY: I don't think, sir, Toronto  
8 City could have absorbed the great influx of people  
9 that we had here.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Exactly, and that is  
11 why the suburbs have rendered a service to Toronto.  
12 Suburbs now have largely residential assessment and the  
13 people living in those houses are working in Toronto,  
14 in property which is commercial and industrial assessment.

15 MR. STAINSBY: True.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: So there has been a  
17 quid pro quo there. I think that is obvious.

18 On page 23 of your brief you deal with  
19 mill rates, and you relate these rates or you have a  
20 table, Appendix 12, on page 23, where you compare the  
21 span between the highest and lowest total residential  
22 mill rates. You show that in your own language the  
23 span between the highest and lowest total rate which  
24 stood at roughly eleven mills in 1954 rose to as much as  
25 twenty mills in the years from 1959 to 1961.

26 You are dealing there with the total rate,  
27 but after all, you are a Board of Education and you  
28 should be concerned primarily with the school rate.  
29 Isn't it a fact that to use your own term, the span as  
30 far as the school rate is concerned was about the same





1 in 1963 as in 1954?

2 MR. STAINSBY: At what page were you refer-  
3 ring to?

4 THE COMMISSIONER: 23. The last para-  
5 graph of that page of your brief. You have a table in  
6 Appendix 12. It is paragraph number two.

7 MR. STAINSBY: I think that was put in, sir  
8 ----

9 THE COMMISSIONER: I beg your pardon?

10 MR. STAINSBY: I think that was included  
11 here because the taxpayer is involved in both these  
12 areas of taxation. He sees both the combined - he gets  
13 the combined tax, the general rate for the local rate,  
14 the mill rate, the Toronto School Board rate and the  
15 Metropolitan School Board rate.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: I know, but you are not  
17 representing the ratepayer here as the municipal and  
18 school ratepayer. You are trying to present the  
19 financial position insofar as education is concerned, and  
20 I am asking you whether it is not a fact that on the  
21 basis of the figures that you produce in Appendix 12,  
22 the span insofar as school rates are concerned is no  
23 greater or was no greater in 1963 than in 1954.

24 MR. STAINSBY: That is right.

25 DR. PHIMISTER: May I answer, Mr. Chairman.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly. I just  
27 want information, Dr. Phimister.

28 DR. PHIMISTER: You must I think consider  
29 the position of the trustees who represent the public.  
30 The public thinks of its tax bill as one bill. It does







1 not separate it out very much. Sometimes people attempt  
2 to do this for us, but the taxpayer thinks of his taxes  
3 as one particular bill.

4 Now, when the taxpayer in Toronto realizes  
5 that his total tax bill, that is the general rate and  
6 education rate, is the highest in the area and has been  
7 the highest in the area now for two or three years--even  
8 higher than Scarborough --this then gives the taxpayer  
9 in Toronto, the home-owner in Toronto reason to question  
10 a trustee and say "why is my tax bill higher than the  
11 tax bill of my neighbour in Scarborough? You fellows  
12 in the education business are throwing away my money for  
13 the benefit of Scarborough who has already a tax bill  
14 less than mine."





1                   While it is true that the education rate in  
2 Toronto is lower than the education rate in Scarborough,  
3 it is also true that the total tax rate general and  
4 education in Toronto is higher than in Scarborough and  
5 has been now for one or two years and is this year again.

6                   THE COMMISSIONER:   When I read, Dr.  
7 Phimister, what you tell me about the services provided  
8 by the Toronto Board of Education and the high standards  
9 established, I would be very much surprised that the  
10 Toronto rate would not be the highest in the area. Would  
11 you not expect it to be the highest in the area with the  
12 range of services - for which I congratulate you?

13                  DR. PHIMISTER:   I think, Mr. Commissioner,  
14 with respect, the education rate - and you are referring  
15 to education services - is not the highest in the area.  
16 It is, I think, the third highest in the area. But I  
17 am talking about the taxpayer's point of view as  
18 reflected to the trustees with respect to the total tax  
19 bill which he receives, which embraces both the education  
20 rate, which is the third highest, and the general rate,  
21 which is highest. So the Toronto taxpayer's total tax  
22 bill is higher than his colleague in Scarborough. The  
23 two things are inexplicably mixed up in the minds of the  
24 taxpayers and are reflected in the trustees of the Board  
25 of Education.

26                  THE COMMISSIONER:   I really think it would  
27 serve a practical purpose if instead of concentrating on  
28 the total rate, leaving that to the City Council, you  
29 actually pointed out what interested me a great deal  
30 when I discovered it from a careful reading of your







1 brief - that actually the span was seven mills insofar  
2 as the school rate is concerned. It was seven mills  
3 in 1954 and it is seven mills in 1963.

4 DR. PHIMISTER: But if I might pursue the  
5 point, I think it would be highly undesirable in an  
6 area as closely knit as this total area to equalize the  
7 education tax rates, which would mean Scarborough's  
8 rate would come down, say, two or three mills - we are  
9 talking about since the difference in assessment - would  
10 come down two or three mills and Toronto's rate would  
11 go up, say, a mill or more than a mill. Scarborough  
12 would come down more than Toronto would come up.

13 The net effect of this would be that a  
14 Scarborough homeowner would have a rate substantially  
15 lower than a Toronto homeowner's rate overall. To set  
16 up this kind of condition is, I think, to immediately  
17 draw to the attention of the taxpayer the fact that he  
18 is spending more and the bulk of his money - hundreds,  
19 millions; at least \$6,000,000.00 goes out from Toronto  
20 for the subsidy of school affairs in these other munici-  
21 palities.

22 To set up this kind of condition would seem  
23 to me to do a very great deal to disturb the whole com-  
24 munity. You cannot expect a homeowner in Toronto to be  
25 paying a substantially greater tax than the homeowner in  
26 Scarborough and have the Scarborough homeowner crying,  
27 "We need more for our schools." The two things, I  
28 submit, are not easily separable.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: That is why you say  
30 that to make the school tax rate uniform alone would not





1 be enough?

2 DR. PHIMISTER: This is the reason for our  
3 statement, yes.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I must say I am  
5 not entirely convinced on your argument. If you want to  
6 develop it further you are free to do so. After all  
7 you could have a uniform tax rate - I certainly have not  
8 made up my mind on this - it seems to me you could have  
9 a uniform tax rate for schools and if the people of  
10 Toronto want more in the way of municipal services  
11 than the people of Scarborough they should be prepared  
12 to pay more by way of municipal taxes, forgetting about  
13 schools.

14 DR. PHIMISTER: I think, Mr. Commissioner,  
15 there might be a solution on your basis of a common  
16 rate overall. We would then need to have two tax  
17 bills. It has been customary, as you realize, to send  
18 the tax bill out as one bill and list the various items  
19 on that bill. If we are to separate general purpose  
20 from educational purpose from residential, then it  
21 would be necessary, in my view, to have this clear in  
22 the public's mind, that it is a common tax rate for  
23 education over the whole area to separate out general  
24 purpose from education purpose.

25 Then you will get into the business of  
26 welfare - the cause for the general rise in the general  
27 rate in Toronto will bring you into the welfare field  
28 and maybe other fields. All that will be a general  
29 rates problem, not an education problem if there were  
30 two tax bills.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I have always felt the  
2 taxpayer should know exactly how much he is paying for  
3 what. I certainly can see considerable merit in your  
4 suggestion on that point, Dr. Phimister; thank you.

5 MR. STAINSBY: If I were to do away with  
6 the privilege of certain people on City Council who al-  
7 ways blame an increase in tax rate on the school rates....

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I read about that too.

9 Coming to the matter to which reference has  
10 been made in a number of the briefs - as you know, yours  
11 is not the first - that is the equality of teacher  
12 salaries, or at least a uniform salary scale, a matter  
13 to which I naturally will have to give considerable  
14 thought, I just want to ask this question. Would a  
15 uniform salary scale actually solve the problem that you  
16 face from the scarcity of teachers? I understand there  
17 is a scarcity particularly of secondary school teachers.  
18 Would a uniform scale solve that?

19 MR. STAINSBY: I would like one of our  
20 academic people to answer this question, sir, though  
21 I believe that I am giving you the right answer when I  
22 say that we have had not too much difficulty in staffing  
23 our schools both secondary and public. Whether their  
24 standard is as high as we would like is a matter I would  
25 like someone else to answer.

26 DR. PHIMISTER: Perhaps Mr. Gore should  
27 speak on this. He is the Superintendent of Secondary  
28 Schools.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: This is an important  
30 problem which has been submitted to me in a number of







1     briefs.

2                   MR. GORE:     Mr. Commissioner, in answer to  
3     your question as to whether the uniform salary schedule  
4     over Metropolitan Toronto would solve our problems, I  
5     must point out, I think, that a great many of our  
6     teachers live not in the centre of the City and that  
7     there are certain advantages to working near your home,  
8     where you do not take time in the morning to come a  
9     long way from home, nor time at night when the work day  
10    is ended.

11                   I think I would be only honest if I said  
12    to you, sir, that a uniform salary schedule over  
13    Toronto to pay in all areas the same would not satisfy  
14    because of the factors which I have mentioned. I think  
15    there would be some right that if a metropolitan board,  
16    if a uniform board operated over all of the secondary  
17    schools, then it would be able to add a different  
18    salary schedule, to, let us say, a downtown school if  
19    they saw the need arising.

20                   THE COMMISSIONER:     That was the answer  
21    that I rather expected. I think I can see a situation  
22    where that uniform salary scale - a teacher might  
23    decide that it is more comfortable to live in  
24    Scarborough or North York or Etobicoke than in Toronto  
25    and you might then face the problem which you are now  
26    facing.

27                   MR. GORE:     That is true.

28                   DR. PHIMISTER:     The difficulty is that  
29    the teachers in some of the areas now are able to  
30    live there also with more money which is an added - I





1 should not say "insult to injury"; perhaps that is the  
2 wrong word.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You want to let them  
4 live there but to pay for it?

5 DR. PHIMISTER: The point would be, under  
6 the Board's submission we would think a policy-making  
7 group which would set a policy which would be to provide  
8 a competent staff for all schools in the area, taking  
9 into consideration the various factors of traffic and  
10 proximity and difficulty and so on - and salary scales  
11 perhaps reflecting that. It was the policy of recruit-  
12 ment and employment that would need to be handled in a  
13 central policy-making body. This is where they would  
14 give us equity for the teachers in the area.

15 MR. BEACH: Mr. Commissioner, could I  
16 make one further comment following upon what Doctor  
17 Phimister has said about the uniform salary scale?  
18 The only person suffering at the moment is the taxpayer  
19 since it is a seller's market and you are really not  
20 getting better teachers for the more money that you are  
21 paying. You are just getting the same teachers but  
22 paying them more because you are in a competitive  
23 situation. It is in truth a rat-race because it is a  
24 seller's market and a uniform salary scale would at  
25 least give more relief to the poor taxpayer.

26 MR. STAINSBY: As far as I can see from  
27 the rates which were offered this year - and correct me  
28 if I am wrong - they were pretty well equalized across  
29 the major areas. We are slightly behind Hamilton. I  
30 think it is only a matter of \$100.00. Except for the







1 far northern regions I do not think we are out of line  
2 with any boards on the basic salary level. I think it  
3 is these special inducements that are throwing us out  
4 of line in the Metropolitan area.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what you call  
6 "headmanship" in your brief.

7 MR. STAINSBY: There are many headmanships  
8 there.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: I have only one more  
10 question and that relates to the administrative districts  
11 which you recommend on pages 78 and following. I  
12 wonder if you would tell me how these administrative  
13 districts would be set up and what their actual functions  
14 would be?

15 I assume that your suggestion that  
16 administrative districts are necessary is a recognition  
17 of some need for decentralization. What would the  
18 members of the boards of these districts actually do?

19 MR. STAINSBY: I think the one need that  
20 a board of education has, particularly from the trustee's  
21 point of view, is to keep a fairly close relationship  
22 with the people that he is representing and with the  
23 schools that come within his realm of authority. The  
24 parents like a trustee to show an interest in their  
25 school because their children are attending there. I  
26 think the principal likes it because it shows he is  
27 getting some recognition from his board. It is not a  
28 thing that is done very often, but they like two or  
29 three or four visits a year. I think they are local  
30 problems that could be dealt with at the local level.





1 I was very interested in reading in the  
2 newspaper last night and again this morning of the  
3 submission made by the Toronto City Council and it  
4 followed along those similar lines to what we have in  
5 mind. I think they suggested some 24 electoral  
6 districts. I think that this might suit the purpose,  
7 and I am speaking now, sir, only as an individual  
8 because we did not know anything about this until  
9 last night and we have mentioned how it should be done  
10 in our brief.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You merely say: "The  
12 geographic area of the City can and should be divided  
13 into districts for administrative purposes and the  
14 establishment of such districts would encourage public  
15 interest at the local level, particularly in the field  
16 of elementary education."

17 I was wondering whether you had developed  
18 any ideas as to whether there would be elected members  
19 of a board or a council in the district or something  
20 else?

21 MR. STAINSBY: I would hazard a guess, sir,  
22 that this group would be headed up by the local  
23 trustee or trustees who happened to represent that  
24 particular area. Where the other people would come  
25 from, I do not think of us have given any thought to  
26 really.

27 MR. GILMOUR: Mr. Commissioner, in one  
28 of the drafts of the brief the Board considered there  
29 was a brief reference to the possible division of the  
30 system into administrative districts but it was felt by





1 the Board that this was a rather nebulous matter without  
2 a great deal of research, and the final position of the  
3 Board was not to make any direct reference to it.

4 May I however take the liberty, Mr.  
5 Commissioner, of referring you to a recent article in  
6 the Toronto Education Quarterly by Dr. Flower in which  
7 the matter of the administration of education is dealt  
8 with in an article which is entitled "The Best of Two  
9 Worlds"? I think possibly what the Chairman has been  
10 speaking about is to some extent dealt with quite  
11 thoroughly in this particular article. I would  
12 commend it to you.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I should say that in  
14 the briefs presented to me there is uniformity on one  
15 point - everybody wants the best of both worlds.

16 Well, that is all I have to ask you. You  
17 have a very thorough brief, Mr. Stainsby, and that is  
18 what led to all the questions. That is the penalty  
19 you have to pay for the thoroughness of the brief which  
20 you presented to me. I know your views and certainly  
21 think that everything you have said will be very helpful  
22 to me when I really face the problem of drafting  
23 recommendations.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MR. STAINSBY: Thank you, sir. You must  
26 realize that this was done with the combined efforts of  
27 many many people spending many many hours before we  
28 finally arrived at what you have before you.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: I can well see that.

30 MR. STAINSBY: Thank you.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Now there is a group  
2 of trustees who have a different point of view speaking  
3 for themselves as members of the Toronto Board of  
4 Education.





1                    SUBMISSION BY A GROUP OF TRUSTEES  
2                    OF THE TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION

3                    APPEARANCES:

4                    Mr. Alec Thompson

5                    Mr. Barry Lowes

6                    Mr. Ernest Jones

7                    Dr. Louis Lockhart

8                    MR. THOMPSON:    I am Mr. Thompson.    Joining  
9                    with me in this brief is Mr. Lowes from Ward 4 and Mr.  
10                   M. Harris from Ward 4 (I do not think he is here).  
11                   Mr. Lowes has been introduced to you, and Mr. Jones  
12                   from Ward 5; he is here; and Dr. Louis Lockhart of  
13                   Ward 5, and myself.

14                   As you may have read, Mr. Commissioner,  
15                   this group of trustees is opposed to amalgamation.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







1 We think that the Metropolitan principle has functioned  
2 very well and it only needs to be continued on a  
3 direction. It is natural after ten years that such  
4 a principle should have to be changed. In fact, as the  
5 Toronto Board's brief has said, the very success of the  
6 building programme which was aided by Metro finances  
7 has raised other problems.

8 Now if I may just run through the brief  
9 without reading it, I have no summary but I think I can  
10 summarize as I go.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, Mr. Thompson.

12 MR. THOMPSON: At the bottom of page 1 we  
13 say that in considering the administration of education  
14 in Metropolitan Toronto the welfare of the child must  
15 transcend all other considerations such as the claim  
16 that the central administration would be more efficient  
17 and economical. Democratic local control must be  
18 ensured for the same reasons.

19 At the top of page 2 we say: "Equalization  
20 of educational opportunity should be afforded to every  
21 child in Metropolitan Toronto as is strongly supported by  
22 the Metropolitan Toronto School Board brief."

23 Basing its argument on that philosophy we  
24 come down to deal with the four problems raised in the  
25 Toronto Board brief. I won't read them now. I will  
26 deal with them seriate.

27 Our general proposal is this that a con-  
28 solidation of the eleven local Boards of Education into  
29 four or five local boards, or it might be six, changes  
30 of the present organization and increase in the authority





1 of the Metropolitan School Board. It calls for carrying  
2 on the Metro principle but changing it. Another point  
3 is legislation to provide for uniform salary scale for  
4 teachers in Metro Toronto. We will deal with that later.  
5 Equalization of the tax rate throughout Metropolitan  
6 Toronto---

7 THE COMMISSIONER: When you talk of  
8 equalization of tax rate are you talking of the school  
9 rate alone or are you talking about the total municipal  
10 and school rate.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Here we were thinking of the  
12 school rate.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what I thought.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Hearing your remarks to our  
15 Chairman it may be that we would have to have an  
16 equalized rate. You say that the City could have other  
17 services and so they might want them in education but it  
18 looks like as far as education goes every school board  
19 in Metro is going to want the same kind of services that  
20 Toronto has been giving. I haven't thought that out.  
21 I will leave it with you.

22 Now I would turn to page 3. We say that  
23 if you do recommend a borough system for the rest of the  
24 City services it would appear that the school district  
25 should be the same. I think that is fairly obvious.  
26 In other words, if you are going to have the City of  
27 Toronto as it exists for the City's services then that  
28 would be the same for school.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: The municipal and school  
30 boundaries should be the same?





1 MR. THOMPSON: I think so. There might be  
2 reasons for it not being. We think each district,  
3 borough, or city should have their own local school board  
4 and the Metro Board should continue to obtain members  
5 from the local board. We think Toronto should continue  
6 as a school district because it has been a pioneer, as  
7 you have heard. It has done a lot of exploratory work  
8 and also it is rather large.

9 It is getting in our opinion rather large in  
10 itself for administration. We do suggest you might in-  
11 clude East York and Leaside in the City and make it a  
12 ward. I am speaking personally now. In the Metro  
13 School brief they said a municipality of over 200,000  
14 was needed to have a proper school administration. Now  
15 I rather doubt that. I think perhaps Leaside and East  
16 York could very well form a separate borough. I am  
17 adding that, it is not in the brief.

18 We do believe also in this local democratic  
19 control and if we have municipalities that do it best  
20 and have quite a good community spirit then they should  
21 not be wiped out needlessly. If they can be continued  
22 efficiently then so much the better. There certainly  
23 are some boards, Leaside for example could not continue  
24 very well alone, I would not think.

25 Then on page 3 we talk about the largeness  
26 of the City of Toronto and its systems of economy and  
27 say it does have a large-scale administration and it  
28 doesn't need to be any larger.

29 We say in the middle of page 4 it would  
30 seem that if such an administration were further enlarged







1 it would lose in efficiency by the multiplicity of  
2 supervision and by the top administrators losing touch  
3 with the subordinates. We give an example of the  
4 consolidation of the School Boards of the Lakeshore,  
5 Weston and Etobicoke as one and the North York Board  
6 as another; the Township of York and perhaps Swansea  
7 and Forest Hill another. I would suggest they would  
8 go with York to make it bigger and not with the City  
9 because that would make the City bigger than ever.

10 We do suggest that the Toronto Board might  
11 include East York and Leaside as a separate board.  
12 Again, if it is big enough for one school district  
13 East York and Leaside could be a sixth borough and the  
14 Scarborough Board, which of course is big, would remain  
15 separate.

16 We think that one amalgamated board would be  
17 too much for efficient democratic operation. It  
18 operates by central control and you would have the huge  
19 amalgamation of administration staff. You would have  
20 a great deal of complexity there. We later on deal  
21 with it if it is divided into districts and I will come  
22 to that later.

23 I think your experience and mine, Mr.  
24 Commissioner, is certainly this: business has had dif-  
25 ficulties with bigness and has countered the increased  
26 costs and diminishing returns of too large administrative  
27 units by decentralization, which someone has hailed as  
28 one of the great inventions of the Western World as  
29 against the monolithic structures of the Communist World.  
30 We don't want a monolithic structure in the admini-





1 stration of schools in Metro Toronto.

2 Business has the advantage over civil  
3 administrations of having the curb of competition to  
4 keep costs down. Civil administrations, when they get  
5 large have no such curb and when very large it is dif-  
6 ficult to see where unnecessary costs exist.

7 If this amalgamated area was to have these  
8 four districts, as has been mooted, then some of the  
9 objections to bigness would not have the same force.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Thompson, I would  
11 say that the Toronto School Board is probably the largest  
12 single Board in Canada.

13 MR. THOMPSON: I would guess so.

14 DR. PHIMISTER: The Roman Catholic School  
15 Board in Montreal would be larger.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: That is not an amal-  
17 gamated Board. The Roman Catholic is not amalgamated.  
18 That is one of the problems that is up right now.  
19 The Protestant Board is.

20 I am sure it is the largest single Board.  
21 Do you think it is too big? Is too big already?

22 MR. THOMPSON: No, I think it is just about  
23 to that point but I don't know. It is anyone's guess.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You are a member of the  
25 Board and I was wondering.

26 MR. THOMPSON: I think our administrative  
27 officials have all they can do to handle the problems.  
28 We have a \$10,000,000.00 building programme and this  
29 year it is going to be bigger than ever. We have  
30 117 or more schools. I submit that is plenty big enough.







1 If we did have 200 schools I fear you would get into the  
2 assistant and these hierarchies of officials. Now it is  
3 not so big that the top officials, Dr. Phimister and the  
4 rest, have the main things at their fingertips. I don't  
5 see how they could if it was any bigger. There are not  
6 that many hours in the day.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: The Catholic School  
8 Board of the City of Montreal is larger. They are now  
9 considering amalgamation or some form of federation  
10 with the Boards outside of the area. I was wrong there.

11 MR. THOMPSON: If such an amalgamated  
12 Board were broken down into districts there is apparently  
13 no local board to set policy. You put your finger on  
14 that, I think, in one of your questions.

15 On page 6 we give some of the functions of  
16 the School Board. The School Boards do more than set  
17 policy; like most administrative boards, including  
18 business corporation boards, they receive reports and  
19 make some enquiry into the progress of the schools and  
20 what is happening and how new policy is being carried  
21 out, and generally oversee their domain. It would be  
22 practically impossible for one general board to oversee  
23 the administration in four or more school districts of  
24 Metro Toronto except with respect to general matters such  
25 as the building programme and teachers' salaries. This  
26 would leave in the hands of the local school-district  
27 director a tremendous amount of power both to set policy  
28 on local matters and to administer his district. We say  
29 neither is desirable.

30 At the bottom of page 6 we say that some of





1 the Boards are too small.

2 On page 7 we suggest that trustees to keep  
3 in touch with the parents should be a continuous two  
4 for each ward and we set out there what some of the  
5 trustees do. Of course, it could be one trustee. I  
6 don't see the point of eliminating these people. The  
7 more people we have mixed up in education the better.  
8 There are only 100-odd trustees in all Metro Toronto,  
9 in a City of nearly 2,000,000 people, and why cut it down  
10 to 25? There is no point to my mind.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You think they help  
12 offset the professionals?

13 MR. THOMPSON: Quite. I think Roy Sharp  
14 said the education is too important to leave to the  
15 professionals. They do a good job with our help.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: They do serve some  
17 purpose.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Therefore on page 7 we say  
19 we don't want to increase the size of the wards and if  
20 Toronto should take in East York and Leaside as a new  
21 ward we think that it should be a new ward or the others  
22 should be enlarged somewhat.

23 We don't think the present Board functions  
24 inefficiently. We have the committee system, which  
25 could be improved, but it does function very well. The  
26 City of Toronto has the committee system and all big  
27 associations have committee systems and they work reason-  
28 ably well. We cannot see why we should streamline the  
29 thing any more and cut out the trustees.

30 Then on page 8 there is a little paragraph







1 here that I would like to bring to your attention:

2 "It may be trite to say this but it bears  
3 repeating, the ordinary citizen often feels lost because  
4 things are so big he doesn't know where to look for help;  
5 he often doesn't know, for example, his legislative  
6 member. To create one Metro School Board with a  
7 relatively small number of trustees would be another  
8 contribution to this lost feeling."

9 Then it is suggested in the Toronto Board's  
10 brief that they might have consultative committees and  
11 we don't think they work out very well. Our advisory  
12 committee is more than a consultative committee and has  
13 the same responsibility and in our mind the committee  
14 should have the responsibility to work best and keep up  
15 its interest.

16 On page 9 we deal with the first problem  
17 that is present in respect to the education field: the  
18 inequitable distribution of provincial burdens. I am  
19 not going to read that except on page 10 we say that the  
20 tax rate should be equalized through Metropolitan Toronto  
21 for the reasons so ably presented in the Metropolitan  
22 Toronto School Board brief. I read the School Board's  
23 brief last night but I did not consider the problem you  
24 have asked. Did that come up this morning?

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Just came up with the  
26 Board of Education brief. That is the question whether  
27 uniform school rates or whether the whole rate should be  
28 uniform.

29 MR. THOMPSON: It might be that the  
30 Toronto Board could submit something further on that.







1 I don't think we are in disagreement on that score.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I think Dr. Phimister  
3 in answer to the question I put made an interesting sug-  
4 gestion. I think we can leave it at that.

5 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, alright. Now the  
6 question of Toronto needing more money for renovations  
7 and their not being able to get it; that I think is a  
8 problem that could be solved and is being solved. We  
9 do point out on page 11 that Toronto would lose itself  
10 a lot of votes probably on an amalgamated Board and  
11 that might not be such a good thing from the view of the  
12 Toronto Board.

13 Then we come to the problem of teacher  
14 recruitment. That could be done in a way such as  
15 legislation or if not the Metro School Board could have  
16 the power to do that. It would at least eliminate, I  
17 would hope, the gimmicks. Under amalgamation if Toronto  
18 wanted to pay extra to bring people downtown you might  
19 have a harder time doing that than you would have under  
20 the Metro Board running their own show on their own.

21 Then there are a few things in the Toronto  
22 brief such as transportation of children and research.  
23 I think transportation of children is, as I say, a matter  
24 of co-operation. With reference to research the Metro  
25 School Board suggests it be put under the School Board.  
26 That is fine. That is continuing the Metro principle  
27 and municipal boundaries are always a headache. We  
28 have them in our own ward. I had a complaint the other  
29 day. You can't get rid of them by amalgamating. Some  
30 of them would be but it might raise others.





On page 13 we sum up the disadvantages of amalgamation:

- (1) Too large for proper administration or too bureaucratic.
- (2) Not democratic.
- (3) Too much trouble and expense in changing right over to amalgamation.
- (4) Lack of diversity.

Toronto has been exploring and it might find that the policy set by one Board, one big Board, it couldn't do the pioneer work that it has been doing.

The advantages of partial consolidation are as follows: consolidation would give strength to the small Boards, make for larger units of a size not much smaller than Toronto. It would be more democratic, each district would have a local board of elected trustees.







1 From such trustees, two, could be appointed  
2 or elected to the Metro Board, or, if based roughly on  
3 population, the Toronto School District Board could send  
4 four or five trustees to the Metro Board, and the others  
5 two each until such time as their respective populations  
6 approached the size of Toronto.

7 The expense and trouble of consolidating  
8 the existing areas into four or five districts and the  
9 administrative consolidation that would follow would  
10 be obviously much less severe than a complete amalgamation.

11 The strengthened local boards could deal  
12 with local problems.

13 There would be more room for diversity and  
14 experiment and in particular, the Toronto Board could  
15 continue its excellent exploratory work.

16 So, then, to sum up we think that the  
17 advantages of amalgamation could all be obtained by  
18 partial consolidation by augmenting the Metro Board  
19 power or by legislative measures, by equalization of  
20 tax rate, by a certain amount of co-operation, but all  
21 that would be under a democratic control which is a  
22 most compelling argument for consolidation.

23 Then on page 15, I think I have dealt with  
24 this before, but it bears repeating. If the proposed  
25 amalgamation would result in one Metro Board making  
26 general policy with administration decentralized into  
27 four or more districts, it would appear that a consol-  
28 idation into four or five districts with a local board  
29 for each district and a Metro Board with co-ordinating  
30 power over buildings, teacher salaries, and distinctly





1 Metro-wide problems, would be definitely preferable.  
2 Such an organization as the latter would, as compared  
3 to the former, merely interpose a local board between  
4 the district and the Metro Board, but what a difference  
5 it would make. It would prevent bureaucratic control  
6 of the local districts, and would carry on the tradition  
7 of democratic local control of and participation in  
8 education, which tradition is sound and desirable.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: That completes your  
10 brief?

11 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
13 Mr. Thompson.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: You speak for - there  
16 are five of you out of a Board of?

17 MR. THOMPSON: Twenty.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We will  
19 now adjourn to to-morrow morning at 10:00 o'clock.

20 ---Whereupon the hearing was adjourned until  
21 Thursday, the 30th day of April, at 10:00 a.m.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30



# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

### HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No. 3 DATE:

6 APRIL 30, 1964.

#### OFFICIAL REPORTERS

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Thursday, April 30th,  
1964, commencing at 10.00 a.m.,  
et seq.

PRESENT:

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.	Commissioner
F. H. Finnis	Secretary
L. Feldman	Research Officer
T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK	611 - 621
THE ETOBICOKE BOARD OF EDUCATION	622 - 643
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE VILLAGE OF FOREST HILL	644 - 671

\* \* \* \* \*







1 THE COMMISSIONER: The Board of Education  
2 for East York, Mr. Eade.

3  
4 SUBMISSION OF  
5 THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
6 FOR THE  
7 TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

8 Appearances:

9 W. E. Eade Chairman  
10 Geo. W. Cartwright Vice-Chairman  
11 James S. Buller, Chairman of Committee  
12 Compiling Brief  
13 D. A. Morrison, Director of Education  
14

15  
16 MR. EADE: The Board of Education for  
17 the Township of East York are happy to present a  
18 resume of the brief that you have already received.  
19 We had a Committee prepare this, sir, and I shall  
20 present the Board members, and the Chairman of the  
21 Committee which prepared it will present the brief.

22 Mr. Cartwright, Vice-Chairman of the  
23 Board of Education of East York, Mr. James Buller,  
24 Chairman of the Committee who prepared the brief,  
25 and who will present it, and Mr. Morrison, our  
26 Director of Education.

27 MR. BULLER: Mr. Goldenberg, I speak,  
28 sir, for the Board of Education for the Township  
29 of East York, formed by private bill in 1937, but  
30 reaching back through its school sections to 1856.





1                   At our policy-making level there are  
2 five trustees elected at large by the public school  
3 supporters, plus one appointee representing the separate  
4 school supporters. The ratio of one elected repre-  
5 sentative for about 15,000 persons assures a close  
6 relationship between electorate and elected.

7                   We are proud of our school system . . .  
8 proud of our above-average plant facilities and our  
9 vigorous programme . . . proud of the 400 teaching and  
10 supervisory staff we recruit and continue to retain,  
11 and yes, Mr. Commissioner, proud of the many who have  
12 gone to positions of responsibility in other areas,  
13 near and far . . . proud of the 100 capable non-  
14 teaching personnel and administrative staff . . .  
15 proud of the liaison among staff, officials and board  
16 . . . proud of the community cooperation through  
17 Home and School associations, churches, service  
18 clubs, ratepayer and other community groups.

19                   In the administration of Metropolitan  
20 school matters we recognize that certain pressures  
21 tend to cloud the "federation" ideal. I cite just  
22 two examples:

23                   1. The voting power is not related to  
24 representation by population. Yet it may be just  
25 as democratically unsound for one-half of the repre-  
26 sentatives to come from one large area as for one  
27 representative of a small area to represent very few  
28 people.

29                   2. The varying financial resources of the  
30 areas causes unrest, especially when the so-called





1 "have" areas become concerned about their so-called  
2 subsidization of the so-called "have-not" areas. We  
3 must remember that Metropolitan Toronto doesn't have  
4 a monopoly on the problems involved in educational  
5 finance. The Canadian and American ships of state  
6 are rocked by similar issues, and we may be sure,  
7 right now, that a solution to the so-called financial  
8 inequalities of the 60's will not provide stock solutions  
9 even for the 70's.

10 Let us not hold the Metropolitan form of  
11 school government itself responsible for the failure  
12 of its members always to keep the "federation" ideal  
13 untarnished. We must not be tempted to throw out  
14 the baby with the bath.

15 Many of the things said to be wrong with the  
16 Metropolitan form of government are debatable, as  
17 are many of the solutions offered as correctives.  
18 Because local knowledge and participation are at  
19 the very roots of democracy, there must be provided  
20 always the machinery for having those services best  
21 performed by smaller size units of government performed  
22 by such units, while other services are performed  
23 by the larger, central, overall unit. In any  
24 attempt to delineate the "optimum" unit we should  
25 remember that there is no more reason to accept  
26 "oversize" than "undersize".

27 On entering the building this morning  
28 I was reminded, sir, that approximately four hundred  
29 years ago the first metropolitan form of government  
30 was established in North America with the formation of







1 the Six Nations, a confederacy of North American Indians  
2 established to protect the common good without en-  
3 croaching on each other's autonomy, yet providing each  
4 tribe with their chiefs, councils, and even their own  
5 medicine men. This arrangement is still functioning,  
6 sir, and it is as one of these ---

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you considering me  
8 as the medicine man?

9 MR. BULLER: No, sir. But, sir, I would  
10 like to challenge all interested persons to look at  
11 this particular arrangement. It is an arrangement  
12 that I am very proud of, sir.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you talking about  
14 the Indian confederacy?

15 MR. BULLER: Yes, sir.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: What provision did  
17 they make for education?

18 MR. BULLER: Well, this is handled locally  
19 within the jurisdiction of their council, and those  
20 who may seem perhaps most fit to handle the situation.  
21 This is an aside, sir.

22 In our brief we listed some of the dangers  
23 associated with "bigness" and centralization. The  
24 reason for the East York Board's hypothesis . . . "That  
25 the Metropolitan form of government be retained in such  
26 a way that the East York school system may continue to  
27 serve" . . . is because we have avoided calling  
28 for the elimination or reduction of one community  
29 or another. At the same time we do observe,  
30 and acknowledge, that our school system could continue





1 to serve within the framework of certain proposals  
2 made in briefs already presented to the Commission.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You have no specific  
4 recommendations for change, is that right, Mr. Buller?

5 MR. BULLER: No. That is true. We feel  
6 that perhaps those who are responsible and those with  
7 the wisdom could perhaps provide us with the proper  
8 path to follow.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you see no need for  
10 change at all as far as the East York Board of Education  
11 is concerned?

12 MR. BULLER: We do not feel, sir, that it  
13 is imperative. We feel reasonably confident that we  
14 can provide the services that our community requires,  
15 and we are quite satisfied, sir, that they are being  
16 performed adequately.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say that East  
18 York is now providing education adequately, is that  
19 in terms of East York standards or in comparison with  
20 the standards in the other municipalities of the area?

21 MR. BULLER: I think, sir, perhaps we  
22 can cite certain examples of families moving in to one  
23 particular area where a great deal of remedial reading  
24 and teaching is required. We find this in one of our  
25 areas. Whether it is an indication, sir, that the  
26 care in the teaching programme in other areas is  
27 perhaps not as concentrated as it is in our system to  
28 provide and bring these pupils to a level that we feel  
29 is to their good.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you agree that







1 there is a financial problem in the area which affects  
2 education because of the unequal resources of the  
3 municipalities?

4 MR. BULLER: Well, in our particular area,  
5 sir, we have cited a figure of \$160,000 which represents  
6 a figure provided to us by the Metropolitan Toronto  
7 School Board in their gains and losses report where  
8 we do benefit to the extent of \$160,000, which in  
9 our township would represent a mill and a fraction,  
10 and I would not say that perhaps we could handle this  
11 within our own municipality. However, I do think,  
12 sir, if it came to an issue, the people of East  
13 York would be quite willing to assume that portion  
14 of their financial responsibility.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Does East York derive  
16 any benefits from the Metropolitan system?

17 MR. BULLER: Yes, we do, sir.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I am talking about the  
19 Board of Education.

20 MR. BULLER: You mean financially or you  
21 mean services?

22 THE COMMISSIONER: You have said finan-  
23 cially you receive \$160,000 more than is paid under  
24 the Metropolitan level.

25 MR. BULLER: Yes.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: But generally do you  
27 feel that you benefit?

28 MR. BULLER: Yes, we do. We receive  
29 benefits in certain areas of secondary school program-  
30 ming in that we do not have the facilities for industrial





1 training to a certain extent, but we do share with  
2 Metropolitan Toronto some of the responsibilities of  
3 the hard of hearing.

4 We have classes in our local schools which  
5 encompass students from Scarborough and other areas  
6 surrounding us. Although we do have a great number  
7 of students who are attending one of the high schools  
8 for their shop training, we have students who are  
9 attending also some of the other vocational training  
10 schools in the surrounding area of Toronto. We do  
11 therefore receive some assistance and benefits through  
12 the Metropolitan school system.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Your own Board of  
14 Education does not provide all the commercial and  
15 technical training that would ordinarily be expected  
16 in a municipality, does it?

17 MR. BULLER: Yes, we provide all the com-  
18 mercial training which is essential at the educational  
19 level, but we do reach out for certain assistance in  
20 certain areas of vocational training. In other  
21 words, we buy this education. We are buying it, sir;  
22 not getting it free.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you confer addi-  
24 tional powers on the Metropolitan School Board?

25 MR. BULLER: I think so, sir, in the way  
26 of certain financial arrangements, yes. In estab-  
27 lishing I think a separate mill rate for the Metro-  
28 politan system there are certain advantages to be  
29 gained by this method.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.





1 MR. BULLER: Thank you, sir.

2 MR. EADE: Might I say a word?

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, certainly, anyone  
4 associated with the delegation.

5 MR. EADE: Before 1953, in fact for a  
6 great many years we have had a common Board of Health  
7 with Leaside, and the nursing service in our schools  
8 is together. This has been going on for a great  
9 many years with a good deal of concord and happiness.  
10 Both areas are satisfied. I am not saying we are  
11 looking for Leaside or Leaside is looking for us, but  
12 that is for them to decide their relationship. We  
13 do not attempt to decide those things, but we have  
14 that concord with them now, and it is working very  
15 well, sir.

16 Our strength in our community is that we  
17 are a small compact area, and our home and school,  
18 our parent-teacher relationships are excellent. I  
19 believe we have the best attendance of parents or  
20 as good attendance as any in the Metropolitan area  
21 of parents at all their meetings. That is what we  
22 pride ourselves on.

23 We have had many visits from outside,  
24 from Windsor staff, from St. Catharines; we had a  
25 couple of gentlemen from the Island of Trinidad. We  
26 have had a great number up viewing our system, and we  
27 are quite proud of it.

28 As you probably noticed in our brief, we  
29 have the tri-level system, kindergarten to 6; 7, 8  
30 and 9, and 10 to 13.







1 We have a number of students in Danforth Technical  
2 School, Toronto. That is where our students go, and  
3 we pay the rate which happens to be one of the highest  
4 in the area, but we are well satisfied with our arrange-  
5 ment with Toronto. They have been most gracious with  
6 us as far as our technical students are concerned. We  
7 haveno fault with our neighbours at all, sir.

8 THE COMMISSIONERS: Do you find it difficult  
9 to keep teachers?

10 MR. EADE: Not at all. I would say our  
11 elementary school teachers, the average length of  
12 service is the highest perhaps in the Metropolitan  
13 area, the length of service. Secondary, of course,  
14 is not normal at present. As you well know the  
15 secondary staff is perhaps more mobile. We do lose  
16 from our Junior High Schools -- we have only four  
17 Junior High schools and North York has perhaps 13 to  
18 15, and men see their chance for advancement, and  
19 we do not blame North York for it in any sense, but  
20 there is advancement there for men to get to principal-  
21 ship or heads of departments, and they do go to North  
22 York and to Scarborough sometimes too because our  
23 development came before 1953 largely, and we have not  
24 benefited from buildings to a large extent since 1953.

25 Most of our development was in schools  
26 built between 1949 and 1953, and most of it since that  
27 time has either been additions or we are now replacing  
28 one old school which is our first new school in several  
29 years.

30 You asked the question, sir, of the





1 commercial branch. Through dominion-provincial grant  
2 we put on a new addition to our collegiate and we have  
3 there all the modern -- we have some of the machines and  
4 so on, IBM and other companies that are quite modern.  
5 We look after our own commercial fully.

6 It is only in the technical branch --  
7 we did make application to the Metropolitan School Board  
8 for a technical branch, but in their wisdom they  
9 thought our area was too small to support one, and  
10 the expense would run too heavily. That is the reason  
11 we didn't get one there.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: I noted with interest  
13 when I asked you about your ability to retain your  
14 teachers, you mentioned North York and Scarborough  
15 as attracting teachers because of better chances of  
16 promotion.

17 MR. EADE: Yes.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: A number of other briefs  
19 have mentioned only one municipality which you have  
20 not mentioned at all. Some have suggested that all  
21 the teachers aim for Etobicoke.

22 MR. EADE: No. We hold no enmity on the  
23 matter. It is the teacher who decides. There is  
24 a better opportunity there for him to become principal  
25 with fifteen junior high schools, or so, than there  
26 is in an area with four junior high schools.

27 -

28 -

29 -







1                   We do lose each year perhaps from ten to  
2 fifteen per cent of our junior high school staff, but  
3 outside of that our elementary staff is very permanent.  
4 We are very fortunate. We are very happy to have the  
5 Toronto Teachers College in our municipality, of course.

6                   Thank you, sir.

7                   THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

8                   MR. EADE: Might I present another member  
9 of our Board of Education - Mr. Martin?

10  
11  
12  
13 -

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 -

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 -

27  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF THE ETOBICOKE BOARD OF EDUCATION

APPEARANCES:

Mr. John D. Parker

Dr. William Graydon

Mr. George A. Kirk

Mr. Emond

Mr. Boone

MR. PARKER: Thank you very much, Mr.

Goldenberg, and I would like to say that we welcome the opportunity to present this brief to you for your consideration. We are fully appreciative of the magnitude of the task which faces you and we hope that in some small way we may be able to assist you.

For your information I would like to stress formally that this brief has been prepared exclusively by the Trustees of the Board and it has been submitted to you as the unanimous opinion of our Board.

It is, Mr. Goldenberg, the belief of the Etobicoke Board of Education that the classroom climate is the key to a sound educational system and that educational administration must be subordinate to the furthering and serving of the work that goes on in the classroom. We further consider that educational opportunity should be a provincial consideration and that a basic educational programme be assured for all. Beyond this the local educational programme should be a matter of local initiative.

Sharing of tax resources is naturally required. The distribution patterns do not coincide with the pattern of detailed variation in taxes and





1 assessment anywhere in the province or in the Dominion.

2 We in Etobicoke are anxious to seek the  
3 solution to local inequities realizing and even welcoming  
4 the fact that Etobicoke will probably become a paying  
5 rather than a receiving Board under such revision. For  
6 this reason we feel changes in the Metropolitan  
7 educational system should be based on education rather  
8 than solely financial considerations.

9 To us it is a fallacy to equate equalization  
10 of educational opportunity with centralization of ad-  
11 ministration. To attempt to legislate uniformity into  
12 existence by a massive amalgamation could only result in  
13 a rigidity which would be inimical to the very essence  
14 of a healthy educational climate in the classroom.

15 The foresight of Ryerson is endorsed by  
16 many recent statements. Time after time the need is  
17 stressed for decentralization to provide for greater  
18 participation by parents and citizens.

19 For example Dr. Harold C. Hunt, the former  
20 General Superintendent of the Chicago, Illinois school  
21 system, now Eliot Professor of Education at Harvard  
22 University, said:

23 "There is almost certainly a point beyond  
24 which districts should not be expanded,  
25 but where that exact point is, no one  
26 knows.

27 I would hazard an opinion that Etobicoke  
28 is approaching that condition. I would,  
29 therefore, urge extreme caution in con-  
30 sidering a merger with or incorporation







1           into a larger school district."

2           I might say, Mr. Goldenberg, that in view  
3 of, shall we say, the paucity of information which  
4 existed regarding the optimum size of school areas we  
5 endeavoured to obtain as much information from responsible  
6 sources as we could to assist us in determining or in  
7 arriving at conclusions as to what we would feel and do  
8 feel is the proper size.

9           I would also point out that Dr. Calvin E.  
10 Gross, the Superintendent of Schools of New York City  
11 said:

12           "The basic thing to lick is communication.  
13 We ought to let a few areas get out ahead  
14 and then ask if the rest of the folks can  
15 catch up. What we need is real community  
16 participation and intramural competition."

17           The late Paul R. Mort, Professor at  
18 Columbia University, New York, said:

19           "One of the chief weaknesses of the big  
20 city system is that it seems to cut off  
21 the operating units from the powerful  
22 influences of the public."

23           Dr. Campbell, Director of the Midwest  
24 Administration Center of the University of Chicago stated:

25           "A city of 1,000,000 population would be  
26 divided into ten to twenty school  
27 districts.

28           Each intermediate unit should be under  
29 the direct central control of a Board of  
30 Education elected at large by the





1 residents of the intermediate unit."

2 He went on further to say that he is con-  
3 vinced that some such division will go far towards  
4 eliminating the bureaucratic outlook among the profes-  
5 sionals and restoring the feeling of local responsibility  
6 among lay citizens.

7 Mr. Carl H. Kumpf, Principal of the  
8 educational system at Newark, New Jersey, said:

9 "It seems characteristic of uniform  
10 programmes that when machinery is set  
11 in motion to swing all teachers to  
12 approved practices, the same machinery  
13 interferes with further creativeness  
14 and inventiveness."

15 It is difficult for an urban school system  
16 below a certain enrollment to offer all the facilities  
17 needed to provide for the individual differences among  
18 children. In our opinion the minimum size from what  
19 we can determine and from what our experience proves is  
20 of the order of the magnitude of 100,000 population. The  
21 upper population, we feel, is possibly in the magnitude  
22 of - well, there is certainly much less than a million.  
23 The small units make possibly a significant community  
24 participation. The private citizen's involvement is  
25 inversely proportional to the elevation of the presiding  
26 officialdom.

27 It is also our opinion that the standards  
28 of excellence and the resultant elevation of the pro-  
29 fession - and I am speaking of the teaching profession -  
30 to an even more attractive level can be achieved at a







1 low per pupil cost. In this respect we refer you to  
2 our Appendix B where you will find that we are able to  
3 operate our educational system, in connection with which  
4 there is evidence available at the Department of Education  
5 and in other areas to substantiate that our educational  
6 system is one that has respect and is of a definite high  
7 standard.

8 If the system is sufficiently small to per-  
9 mit close personal scrutiny - and we believe it is - if  
10 the system is sufficiently small to permit close personal  
11 scrutiny by the trustees of all expenditures (and we  
12 have to admit that we consider this is the key to why  
13 we in Etobicoke have been able to maintain our position)  
14 excellence is achieved, we believe, by discernment and  
15 judgment and need cost no more than mediocrity.

16 These standards apply equally to the physical  
17 educational plant. We are frankly most pleased and  
18 certainly proud to state that Kipling Collegiate Institute  
19 in Etobicoke was built within the Metropolitan Toronto  
20 debenture ceiling formula - which is something frankly  
21 that requires considerable effort to do. Although it  
22 cost less than many other schools it was awarded a  
23 Massey Medal for architecture.

24 In conclusion, I think I must partly re-  
25 iterate our brief in that we submit that the meeting of  
26 minds is the sole final purpose of any educational organ-  
27 ization however elaborate and that the interests of  
28 children and teachers must be paramount. We would  
29 welcome modifications that would be in the best interests  
30 of education. We sincerely believe that in Metro





1 Etobicoke already possesses an unique educational  
2 system which is entitled to survive without radical  
3 change because it satisfies the great majority of the  
4 people it serves. It is our submission that Egerton  
5 Ryerson recognized that certain attributes of education  
6 involve a personal element essential to its vitality.  
7 These are still relevant to our situation today and must  
8 be preserved.

9 Of course our recommendation is that we  
10 recommend that education in the Metropolitan Toronto  
11 area continue to be administered by a number of  
12 autonomous locally elected boards of education which  
13 have the authority to raise funds by taxation and the  
14 right to control their own fiscal and educational  
15 policies. Such local boards of education should  
16 represent areas of not more than 300,000 population.

17 That concludes my formal remarks, Mr.  
18 Goldenberg. I would be only too pleased to elaborate  
19 and submit answers to any questions that you might have.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Looking at your recom-  
21 mendation that education continue to be administered by  
22 a number of autonomous locally elected boards, I want  
23 to ask you whether it would make any difference to you  
24 if the Metropolitan School Board were abolished?

25 MR. PARKER: Due to our present development,  
26 due to the fact that we have reached, shall we say, the  
27 completion of the development of the area, on the  
28 statistics that I have observed and from the information  
29 we have it would appear that we have reached a place  
30 where we could operate our own educational system.







1                   We have continuously been in a position that  
2 while we were a receiving Board we were a minimal  
3 receiving Board. To me it is quite interesting to be  
4 able to state that if today we were to levy \$25.00 from  
5 every taxpaying ratepayer up until this year it would be  
6 possible to discharge the debt - if that is the proper  
7 word - or to return the advantages that we have received  
8 monetarily from the present system.

9                   However, we are not advocating such a  
10 departure. We are quite prepared to operate within the  
11 Metropolitan area. It has been referred to so often as  
12 a heterogeneous group. As each year passes it becomes  
13 homogeneous. It is becoming more urbanized. The type  
14 of people that live in any particular area seem to live  
15 in the majority areas. It can be in my opinion con-  
16 sidered a homogeneous entity.

17                   THE COMMISSIONER: So when you say that  
18 education should continue to be administered by a number  
19 of autonomous locally elected boards you mean a number of  
20 such boards working with the present type of Municipal  
21 School Board?

22                   MR. PARKER: We do.

23                   THE COMMISSIONER: That is what you mean.  
24 Is Etobicoke still a receiving municipality - to use your  
25 own term?

26                   MR. PARKER: To use the colloquial term,  
27 Etobicoke is at present a receiving municipality.

28                   THE COMMISSIONER: You are aware, of  
29 course, of the submissions in almost of the briefs to  
30 date criticizing the policy of the Etobicoke Board of







1 Education insofar as teachers' salaries are concerned.

2 Have you any comments on that criticism?

3 MR. PARKER: Well, I must thank you for  
4 opening the gate to us. We are, I must admit, only  
5 familiar with such briefs as have been publicly submitted  
6 here. We have not received copies of the briefs. They  
7 have not been interchanged. We were not informed, as  
8 it were, with regard to some of the points that have come  
9 out before you.

10 We must state frankly that it is our belief  
11 that if it were not for the salary action sparked on the  
12 part of various individual boards we would not have in  
13 our opinion as many honoured graduates being recruited  
14 from the Universty but more particularly from business  
15 and industry and that the shortage would be in fact  
16 more acute than it now is.

17 Frankly it has been our experience that by  
18 attending these various discussion groups to find out  
19 that the main reason presented annually for a uniform  
20 salary has basically been the desire expressed by  
21 certain individuals to hold the line.

22 The demand and supply of the past five  
23 years or more makes such a approach entirely unrealistic  
24 and not in the best interests of education in either the  
25 Metro Toronto area nor in the Province. Competition  
26 cannot be eliminated and I would like to point out to  
27 you that there has not been a year since the establish-  
28 ment of the Metropolitan school system that the boards  
29 have not paid comparable basic salaries. We have always  
30 paid the same salary because of the economic pressure or





1 the fact that we all must meet the same dollar competition.

2 As you know, we in Etobicoke have introduced  
3 - and I think is the crux of some of the points that have  
4 been brought before you - a plan which we refer to as a  
5 master teacher plan. We took particular care to remove  
6 this plan from the position where it could be inferred  
7 that it was a competitive tactic or that it represented  
8 a desire on the part of our Board to take advantage over  
9 other boards.

10 We have on two occasions endeavoured to  
11 persuade other Metropolitan Boards of the things which  
12 we maintain have been necessary to upgrade the teaching  
13 profession and place it in a position where we could  
14 compete with all other professions and that certain  
15 action had been taken.

16 In 1956 we made a proposal and the action  
17 of other boards has been <sup>to</sup> completely nullify it by instead  
18 of applying it in the manner in which we desire it has  
19 always been spread over the entire salary structure  
20 irrespective of any other basis than the three proposals  
21 brought forward to you yesterday by Mr. Davidson, namely  
22 classification, experience and responsibility.

23 We submit our master teacher plan has  
24 attempted to meet realistically some of the conflicts  
25 of the salary structure in secondary education to enable  
26 competent teachers to be retained in the classroom rather  
27 than being forced, as Mr. Eade pointed out to you today,  
28 that if they desire to climb up the ladder of economics  
29 to become administrators and go to other areas.

30 Referring to our master plan at this time







1 there are two things that are most significant. One is  
2 the ebb and flow of teachers to our Board. As far as  
3 the appointment in each year of teachers to our staff,  
4 as you can see by Appendix B, the total of teachers  
5 appointed has always been minimal - 1.5%, 2.5% and the  
6 assistant head 6.2%. But I realize now that I have  
7 drifted from my main point.

8 One of the requirements built into our plan  
9 was in the master headship. That teacher first of all  
10 must be a teacher who has had fifteen years' experience.  
11 Secondly he must have been with us engaged in the  
12 employ of the Etobicoke Board for five years. In our  
13 opinion this should be evidence of the fact that it is  
14 not a gimmick to, shall we say - I will use another word  
15 that I may have to eat - to raid or to attract in any  
16 undue method or any improper method people to our system.

17 Again the number of people on our staff -  
18 this, I think, will emphasize the fact that we are not  
19 exploiting this - the number of master heads which we  
20 have or the number of people who are on our plan in  
21 relation to our total staff is less than 10%.

22 Secondly, to show that it is a discriminatory  
23 plan and not one that is operated on a free and easy  
24 system so that anybody can feel that they are going to  
25 get in, less than 60% of those eligible are within the  
26 plan. Consequently we are trying to operate this plan  
27 in the interests of better educational opportunities for  
28 our children and with a sincere desire to make it unneces-  
29 sary for these skilled and competent and dedicated  
30 people who desire to teach to have to abandon their





1	chosen field if they are to receive adequate compensation.
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	





1 Now, this subject, as you can well  
2 imagine, is very close to the hearts of every Trustee  
3 on our School Board. Now, I have already committed  
4 one faux pas. This is par for the course. Now I  
5 would like to give my fellow trustees who are with  
6 me today an opportunity to elaborate or explain their  
7 opinions. First, I would like to rectify my social  
8 error by introducing to you the members of our Board  
9 who are here to help me in this presentation.

10 I would first like to introduce Dr.  
11 Graydon and Mr. Kirk. I also have with me the Business  
12 Administrator, Mr. Emond and the Supervisor of  
13 Secondary Education, Mr. Boone.

14 Now, Dr. Graydon and Mr. Kirk, with  
15 your permission, sir, if you would like to particularly  
16 address any comments with respect to this subject I  
17 would be only too glad.

18 MR. KIRK: With your permission, sir,  
19 I would like to draw attention to some facts relating  
20 to the subject of teachers. I quote from the President's  
21 Report, Dr. Bissell's Report to the Board of Governors  
22 of the University for the year ending June, 1962:

23 "Even now the scarcity and the mal-distribution  
24 of qualified secondary school teachers -- that is,  
25 teachers with Type A or Type B endorsed certificates --  
26 must give rise to the gravest concern. Of 447 secondary  
27 schools in Ontario there were in 1961 - 1962, 167 with  
28 no qualified mathematics teachers and 115 with no  
29 qualified English teachers and those are not just from  
30 small schools; many of them have from 500 to 1,000 pupils.







1 Those high schools outside the large urban centres  
2 are underprivileged now, and the effect of taking  
3 away from them the few qualified teachers they now  
4 have an opportunity to encounter would be disastrous."

5 If I might follow that up, even schools  
6 in the Metropolitan Toronto area have been unable to  
7 staff their classrooms in all subjects with teachers  
8 holding qualifications that were taken for granted  
9 ten years ago. Therefore, some of the criticism that  
10 has been directed at Etobicoke I am quite sure has  
11 been directed because of lack of understanding of the  
12 focus in which we view this problem.

13 At present only 18% of the secondary  
14 school teachers entering the teaching profession of  
15 this Province do so via the winter course at OCE.

16 A great many of the efforts of our  
17 Board have been directed towards improving that  
18 situation and Mr. Parker touched on the initial effort  
19 which was thwarted, I think, about eight years ago  
20 when we tried to give an incentive to the Type A. These  
21 are people who have taken the four year honour course,  
22 submitted themselves to the discipline of the four-year  
23 honour course at University.

24 We found that we could not implement  
25 a plan which was acceptable to our own teachers because  
26 the other Metropolitan School Boards insisted on raising  
27 all teachers within that category to the level which we  
28 had set or were attempting to set for people who had  
29 taken the four-year inter-mural course and the course  
30 at OCE.





1                   There are other things we have done.  
2   We don't mention them because we wanted to keep the  
3   brief short and we felt, I think I express the feeling  
4   of the other Trustees when I say that we did not  
5   particularly wish to be like the Chanteclair sitting  
6   on a dung heap and crowing, saying: "Look what we do."  
7   Nothing is further from our mind.

8                   As a result of action taken by the  
9   Board in the field of language teaching, there are  
10  four or five Type A specialists, teachers of French  
11  and German available for the whole Province at the  
12  end of May of this year. You can go back over the  
13  tables of the last ten years and you will find that  
14  the teacher, which is reflected in Dr. Bissell's report,  
15  is a typical teacher.

16                  By allocating the sum of something like  
17  \$4,000.00 in a total secondary school budget of  
18  \$4,000,000.00 to bring an assistant from Germany for a  
19  year we gave leadership which resulted in the teachers  
20  of the Province voting at the Easter Convention of the  
21  OEA the sum of \$400.00 given to a winter course student  
22  who spends the summer in France or Germany improving  
23  qualifications.

24                  I mention these things because I think  
25  this is a perspective in which the efforts of our Board  
26  has not been viewed. Thank you.

27                  MR. GRAYDON: Sir, in Etobicoke, and  
28  I think even in a much broader way than that, the real  
29  problem facing the school system of the future in this  
30  metropolitan area is one of teachers. I think we would







Graydon

1 be very unwise to be complacent about the teaching  
2 profession in this day.

3 Mr. Kirk has pointed out some of the  
4 difficulties that are foreseen. The Universities are  
5 only beginning in this rise of enrollment which is  
6 going to put great pressure on this whole field.  
7 We feel in Etobicoke that is a major part of our  
8 responsibility to foresee the need for an ever-increasing  
9 recruitment of ever-better qualified people to the  
10 teaching profession.

11 One of the real difficulties which we  
12 have seen standing in the way of this recruitment has  
13 been the limiting effect that a non-differentiated  
14 salary scale has on the maximum figures. The public,  
15 we feel, are unwilling to pay professional salary  
16 levels when the scale of remuneration is not differenti-  
17 ated on the basis of judgment of professional excellence.  
18 Our society does not associate this kind of wage scale  
19 with the professional group of gentlemen.

20 We felt that in order to provide a  
21 beginning, if you like an experiment, a start in a  
22 look at this, some procedure by which the interest of  
23 the best young people at the Universities might be drawn  
24 to the teaching profession, that this plan which we have  
25 was a way of doing that. We realized when we started  
26 on this that this would be misinterpreted and we made  
27 a special effort, as Mr. Parker has pointed out, to  
28 avoid that misinterpretation. In all cases experience  
29 in Etobicoke is required.

30 The other side of the picture has to do





1 with the fact that although promotions elsewhere are  
2 understood, these promotions are not for the very  
3 reasons that we promote a teacher on the basis of his  
4 recognized teaching excellence and tell him to keep  
5 teaching; rather than he must change his precise form  
6 of occupation in order to receive monetary recognition  
7 of his teaching excellence.

8                   These are the two things which we thought  
9 to correct in the Etobicoke salary schedule and that  
10 resulted in the plan. In all other respects our  
11 salary schedule is identical. There may be small  
12 variations. It is not identical but it is certainly  
13 equivalent in the basis of experience and qualifications.  
14 The rates are the same. Thank you, sir.

15                   THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Parker, I can  
16 well see the importance of a policy of raising  
17 teachers' standards and encouraging the recruitment  
18 of teachers, but I have been told that in the situation  
19 in which Metropolitan Toronto finds itself it does  
20 not make for good relations if one area municipality,  
21 particularly when it is on the receiving side, enforces  
22 higher standards than the other municipalities and that  
23 that has had the effect of preventing the necessary  
24 increases in the maintenance assistance payments to the  
25 Department of those who really need them. Would you  
26 make some comments on that?

27                   MR. PARKER: I would be only too pleased.  
28 As was pointed out yesterday, punitive action was  
29 attempted by the Metropolitan School Board in connection  
30 with the maintenance assistance payment and I will accept







1 it was directed basically at one Board, the Etobicoke  
2 Board. To me this very action was most disturbing  
3 to think that an organization which was established  
4 for the purpose of seeing that all children within  
5 the Metro area would receive -- I don't think it was  
6 equal education -- but would receive a sufficient start  
7 from the Metropolitan School Board to enable it to  
8 operate within the physical policies and the educational  
9 policies that it desired, that it would take an action  
10 that would result in certain Boards having to curtail.

11 To me the complete vision, and even  
12 the philosophy of the existence, or the raison d'etre  
13 for the Metropolitan Board were abrogated when that  
14 particular action was taken.

15 Of course I regretted it was necessary.  
16 I was also pleased to see by the result of the loyalty,  
17 basically of the suburban Boards who desired to make  
18 the Metropolitan concept function and operate as planned,  
19 that they persisted in operating within it to the  
20 greatest degree and that this year the Metropolitan  
21 again did accept the responsibility that was its and  
22 it was laid open and restored the percentage of mainten-  
23 ance assistance payment plan that was envisaged and  
24 anticipated; and speaking as a person who was a member  
25 of the first Metropolitan School Board prior to this  
26 even being considered included in the legislation,  
27 restored to the 60% figure. I don't think anybody who  
28 has reviewed the situation could help but realize the  
29 significance and the importance of that maintenance  
30 assistance payment being approximately within that







1 percentage.

2 Now I don't know whether I have  
3 answered your question the way you desired.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Not exactly, Mr.  
5 Parker. Taxpayers are human and human nature being  
6 what it is, don't you think there is some validity in  
7 the argument that taxpayers of one municipality should  
8 not be called upon to contribute to assist taxpayers of  
9 another in order to help the receiving municipality  
10 to maintain higher standards in a service which they  
11 share in common?

12 MR. PARKER: Human nature being what  
13 it is I can understand the validity of the points that  
14 you make, but it has been my experience that this is  
15 one of the characteristic differences between a  
16 School Board and a Council; the Council invariably  
17 is placed in the position that the type of services  
18 which it supplies are critically regarded and the costs  
19 involved with it are very critically regarded by  
20 ratepayers.

21 You will notice Mr. Eve this morning  
22 did not complain with regard to the salary details or  
23 salary schedule being operated attracting teachers away  
24 from the Board.

25 It has also been characteristic that  
26 any School Board which has endeavoured to provide  
27 educational opportunities, and the educational system  
28 that the people of the area want, invariably receives  
29 the support of the people. It is my opinion basically  
30 that the plan with regards to the educational programme





1 being provided by respective Boards is not being  
2 decried in any other area or municipal area by the  
3 people. It is invariably introduced by those people.

4 We now come back to involve in the  
5 financial operations of the programme. This is a per-  
6 sonal opinion but I certainly must admit that I had  
7 not noticed any hue and cry in any metropolitan area  
8 with regards to a desire to have their educational  
9 systems restricted as to the quality of the education  
10 that is being supplied.

11 I think you yourself will admit if  
12 today's problems are going to be met, if the advances  
13 in technology and the various sciences which have  
14 occurred are going to be brought to the benefit of  
15 all of us, that there must be an improvement in our  
16 educational systems.

17 Now you gave me a chance to spout and  
18 I trust you don't regret it.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: This is an important  
20 issue and I have to give it serious consideration. You  
21 have said that the people of a municipality are  
22 entitled to the educational system which they want.

23 MR. PARKER: Yes.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Are they entitled to  
2 that system whether or not they can pay for it entirely  
3 by themselves?

4 MR. PARKER: I would say no. I would  
5 agree, no, but I would further state that people of an  
6 area should not be deprived of it if they are prepared  
7 to meet the additional cost. Perhaps before we have  
8 an unfortunate incident.....

9 DR. GRAYDON: Surely this is a matter of  
10 choice. The question is not one of having a better  
11 education. It is one of stressing a certain aspect  
12 of the total picture which, truly indeed, costs some  
13 money, but the number that surely is pertinent is how  
14 much it costs to educate one student for a given period  
15 of time. You have had these numbers I am sure time and  
16 again, and you will notice that the Etobicoke position  
17 is not high on this list. We do not spend a great  
18 deal of money per pupil. We choose to emphasize -  
19 and it is in our brief as well - we are about fourth or  
20 fifth; we are the lowest of the big Boards I think in  
21 Toronto - and what we have done, you see, is decide not  
22 that we want to spend all this money, but we have  
23 decided we want to emphasize one thing which is keeping  
24 excellent teachers in the classroom, and we will forego  
25 and we have foregone other items. Our buildings by  
26 and large are built to a much more utilitarian standard,  
27 and by that I mean plain and simple standard, than is  
28 common elsewhere. Our teachers in many ways I think  
29 are limited in expenditures, so we have only spent our  
30 dollar differently.





1 We have spent fewer dollars, and the amount  
2 by which we have benefited from any other group is very  
3 small as a percentage. Very, very small indeed.  
4 Even the absolute amounts.

5 I think what Mr. Parker gave you is a  
6 summation over all the years of \$25.00 a taxpayer. Now,  
7 we are grateful for this, sir. We are grateful for  
8 this \$25.00 we have received over the years. We do not  
9 wish to seem ungrateful, but we really do not think  
10 that this is the basis upon which we have established  
11 our educational system.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: You have answered the  
13 next question that I was going to ask. My next question  
14 was going to be have you offset any possible higher  
15 standard in teachers' pay by saving on some other  
16 phases of the school finances as compared to other  
17 municipalities, and you have answered that question.

18 DR. GRAYDON: Yes, sir. Even in the  
19 very teaching itself, because I think you will find  
20 that teachers know that Etobicoke is a place where they  
21 are appreciated and where the pay is high and the work  
22 is hard.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, what  
24 you are saying is that it is wrong to pick on one  
25 item of school expenditure.

26 DR. GRAYDON: Thank you, sir.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: As I say, I was leading  
28 up to that.

29 MR. PARKER: I would be only too glad if  
30 Dr. Graydon would continue to anticipate your questions.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: This was really the  
2 principal matter that I wanted to question you on today  
3 because there is constant reference to Etobicoke in  
4 relation to teachers' salaries.

5 MR. PARKER: That is correct. To put it  
6 in its simplest terms, our attitude <sup>is it</sup> depends on what you  
7 want to spend your money.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: And how you want to  
9 spend it?

10 MR. PARKER: And how, that is right.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
12 Mr. Parker.

13 Is there anyone here from Forest Hill Board  
14 of Education? I asked them to come this morning  
15 instead of this afternoon, and they said they would.  
16 I will adjourn now for fifteen minutes.

17 ---SHORT ADJOURNMENT.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Mrs. Grossberg,  
2 Forest Hill Board of Education.

3 SUBMISSION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
4 FOR THE VILLAGE OF FOREST HILL

5 APPEARANCES:

6 Mrs. B. Grossberg	Chairman
7 Dr. George Flower	Consultant
8 Mr. Arthur Ouellette	Business Administrator
9 Mrs. Jean Shepherd	Vice-Chairman
10 Mr. Samuel Kertzer	Member
11 Mr. E. H. Blachford	Member

12 MRS. GROSSBERG: Mr. Goldenberg, ladies  
13 and gentlemen, before making an oral presentation I  
14 would like to introduce the members of our Board first  
15 of all. Dr. George Flower, Director of Graduate  
16 Studies at the Ontario College of Education who has  
17 been our Consultant; Mr. Arthur Ouellette, Business  
18 Administrator of the Forest Hill Board, Mrs. Jean  
19 Shepherd, Vice-Chairman of the Board, Mr. Samuel  
20 Kertzer and Mr. Ed. Blachford.

21 It is with very great regret, Mr. Goldenberg,  
22 that I tell you our Director of Education, Mr. D. M.  
23 Graham is seriously ill in hospital and cannot be with  
24 us today, but anyone knowing Mr. Graham, and having read  
25 our brief, would realize what a very large part he had  
26 in both the concept and the writing of the brief.

27 We feel that in Forest Hill Village we  
28 provide an excellent education for our pupils, and  
29 this view is shared by many. Our reputation as a  
30 "lighthouse" school system has spread from coast to





1 coast, and I believe our reputation is well deserved.

2 It might be expected therefore, that we  
3 would strenuously resist any change and would strive to  
4 retain the status quo. However, we have come to accept  
5 the fact that some reorganization is inevitable and  
6 that such reorganization would necessarily encompass  
7 larger units than Forest Hill Village.

8 Our main concern in this brief is not to  
9 present specific recommendations as to boundaries and  
10 the like. It is not intended to present ways in which  
11 the special and perhaps selfish interests of Forest Hill  
12 might be preserved. Rather, we thought we could perform  
13 a service which others might overlook, in terms of  
14 raising questions for careful consideration so that  
15 any new structure - be it Super Metro or a series of  
16 boroughs or anything else, as far as possible, retain  
17 the natural advantages of the well-structured and well-  
18 functioning smaller organization - while achieving some  
19 of the financial advantages which apparently only  
20 larger size will permit.

21 In other words, we will attempt to suggest  
22 how the best of both worlds, or as much of it as pos-  
23 sible can be attained - the best of the small, the best  
24 of the large. And to get this, we have to think in  
25 terms of patterns of organization within any larger  
26 school system. We are worried by so many evidences of  
27 apparent willingness to contrast the well-known worst  
28 of what we have with the hoped for best of what might  
29 result from the larger size.

30 If larger size is inevitable - and as







1 stated in our brief, we are inclined to agree that it  
2 is - then there are a great many questions that should  
3 be faced before any move to such larger size. We must  
4 consider very carefully how the internal organization  
5 must be arranged so as to retain the most important  
6 advantages of smaller size.

7           You would not wish us to review our brief  
8 in detail. But clearly one of the organization truths  
9 which have been amply documented by students of business,  
10 government, and education administration alike is that  
11 organizational goals and individual goals of those  
12 lending their labour to the organization must go hand  
13 in hand, and both must be reasonably satisfied if the  
14 organization is to prosper. The root problem of  
15 organization is the accommodation of the one and the  
16 many. The whole point of our brief, then, is that  
17 planning is necessary in advance to take these matters  
18 into account. It will not be too helpful, as some  
19 others have done, to suggest for example, rather piously,  
20 that whatever larger board or boards which is to be set  
21 up must "...make every effort to keep in close touch  
22 with individual schools and with the hopes and aspira-  
23 tions of individual sub-communities." It strikes us  
24 that what is needed is some planning for appropriate  
25 organization in advance in order to ensure such  
26 functioning as far as possible; indeed if it cannot be  
27 ensured, then it may be necessary to look again - even  
28 to the extent of modifying somewhat - the decision to  
29 move to a larger board or boards.

30           As we see them, the natural advantages of





1 the well-structured and well-functioning smaller school  
2 system are seen to be mainly five:

3 (a) the encouragement of previous individual  
4 initiative

5 (b) ease of communications and simplicity of  
6 coordination

7 (c) a high order of human relations

8 (d) the point of decision correctly close to  
9 the point of action

10 (e) responsiveness of local officials and local  
11 schools directly to the local community they  
12 serve, and not merely to a distant "higher  
13 authority."

14 In an effort to maintain these advantages,  
15 certain proposals are recommended in our brief for  
16 study in planning for any larger school system or  
17 systems. Prime among these is decentralization of  
18 operation to a number of geographical area divisions  
19 within the larger system. Envisaged would be:

20 (a) a single elected board of education for the  
21 entire larger school system. The board's  
22 staff would be headed by an official who  
23 might be known as the Senior Director of  
24 Education.

25 (b) decentralization at the staff and operational  
26 level to a series of smaller school divisions,  
27 each serving an appropriate geographical and  
28 sociological entity within the larger com-  
29 munity.

30 (c) each area division to be headed by a director





1 of education, and to be reasonably self-  
2 contained as to specialist staff services.

3 (d) the staff of the central offices of the larger  
4 school system to be relatively small, with  
5 every effort made to decentralize staff for  
6 specialist services to the division level;  
7 the central staff would of course be suf-  
8 ficiently large to perform its prime function  
9 of coordination and to carry on those items  
10 of system-wide import - especially matters  
11 of finance and accounting - which can be  
12 most readily centralized.

13 (e) closer coordination of elementary and secondary  
14 schools through placing both directly under  
15 the divisional directors of education.

16 If I could just stop here a minute, Mr.  
17 Goldenberg, I have available copies of a report on a  
18 research study done by the Ontario School Trustees  
19 Council on articulation between elementary and secondary  
20 schools in Ontario. I would say that we were really  
21 very shocked at the absence of articulation between  
22 these two levels, and that is one of the reasons we  
23 have stressed this closer coordination of elementary  
24 and secondary schools. I have copies of this available  
25 with me if you would like to see them.

26 (f) prescription of the broadest possible area  
27 of freedom in instructional matters for each  
28 division, with staff working closely with  
29 the local community it serves.

30 With reference to decentralizing legis-







1     lative and policy-making functions to local boards  
2     within a larger school system, as contrasted to internal  
3     decentralization of operation, extremely difficult  
4     problems arise. Experience elsewhere seems to indicate  
5     that, as a practical matter, so little in the way of  
6     autonomy could be granted to local boards by an  
7     operative central board that such vestigial local boards  
8     would be something of a sham.

9         (a) It is therefore suggested that careful study  
10        be given to the notion of a new and alternative  
11        type of public body, with the suggested name of  
12        Education Council, for each school division  
13        within the larger school system.

14       (b) Such education councils would be frankly advisory,  
15        although officially elected directly or in-  
16        directly. They would be advisory to the  
17        divisional director of education and his staff  
18        in all matters of implementing, locally, the  
19        policies of the larger board of education.  
20        They would be free to make recommendations  
21        to that board of education, and the emphasis  
22        of their operation would be on investigation,  
23        inquiry, and communication with the local  
24        public. It would be hoped the such education  
25        councils would serve to keep school divisions  
26        and schools locally responsive to the sub-  
27        communities they serve, as well as to develop  
28        public interest, support, and understanding  
29        of the work of the schools.

30       (c) The staff of each school division and school,





1 further, should be required to develop and  
2 maintain the closest possible working relation-  
3 ships with community and sub-community.

4 (d) Time and training would have to be provided  
5 for employed officials at area and school  
6 levels to work with citizens as an assigned  
7 and integral part of their responsibilities.  
8 Indeed the question of executive development  
9 and redevelopment is so vital, in view of  
10 the importance and difficulty of integrating  
11 personal and organization goals within any  
12 organization, that the Forest Hill Board  
13 believes a concentrated programme in this  
14 regard should be undertaken regardless of  
15 whether or not major changes occur in the  
16 governmental structure of public education  
17 for Metropolitan Toronto.

18 The Forest Hill Board of Education believes  
19 that the schools of the Village are good schools. If  
20 some reorganization in Metropolitan Toronto is to be  
21 undertaken, our hope would be that the new design would  
22 be such as to result in still better schools - for  
23 Forest Hill as well as for our neighbours.

24 In closing may I make plain, Mr. Goldenberg,  
25 that in not dealing with matters of finance in our brief  
26 we in no sense have intended to leave the impression  
27 that such matters are unimportant. Of course they  
28 are important - and they will have both immediate and  
29 long-term importance for every citizen.

30 But we have left these aside with the







1 thought that others will be dealing with them thoroughly.

2           What we have tried to do is to offer some  
3 suggestions for consideration toward planning some  
4 structure which may realize not only the advantages of  
5 larger size in terms of finance among other factors,  
6 but which at the same time may see retained something  
7 of the important human and organizational advantages of  
8 smaller size. We do care for people, Mr. Commissioner;  
9 they and their needs must be taken into account - in  
10 part because of the supreme importance of the individual  
11 in the long run, in part for the very practical reason  
12 that no organization for schools will function well and  
13 long if clear-cut arrangements are not written into the  
14 structure of that organization so that "...teachers will  
15 not be simply educational spare parts, pupils not merely  
16 numbers, and parents - as representatives of the community  
17 served by the schools, not regarded as necessary evils,  
18 to be tolerated but not encouraged."

19           We believe that it is not enough merely to  
20 state that one is concerned about this kind of thing;  
21 what is needed is definite planning to take it into  
22 account. We hope that our proposals for decentralization,  
23 within any larger system or systems which may be esta-  
24 blished, could serve this purpose.

25           THE COMMISSIONER: Do any of your  
26 associates want to elaborate on anything? Well, Mrs.  
27 Grossberg, I was interested in your brief which I have  
28 read rather carefully. I congratulate you on the  
29 moderation of your approach to the overall problems of  
30 Metro.





1 My main question relates to your proposed  
2 decentralization to geographic area divisions which you  
3 deal with in some detail on pages 24 and 25. You say  
4 that each area division should be relatively self-  
5 contained. Could you tell me what you mean by "relatively  
6 self-contained"? What authority would it have?

7 MRS. GROSSBERG: I feel that as far as  
8 administration of the area would be concerned the  
9 divisions within the larger school system, that there  
10 would be, as I have stated, a director of education;  
11 he would have a staff that would be under his  
12 jurisdiction.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1           It is the idea of the flat organization  
2 rather than having the superintendent of elementary  
3 schools reporting up to the superitendent of elementary  
4 schools in ~~the~~ large central office; so that it would be  
5 relatively self-contained.

6           I think probably either Dr. Flower or Mr.  
7 Ouelette could enlarge upon that.

8           THE COMMISSIONER: Let me go on to the  
9 next question which relates to what you say towards  
10 the end of same paragraph - "each area division would  
11 be so staffed and structured as to offer complete  
12 school services for its area responsive to its own  
13 area and probably differing in many matters of detail  
14 from adjoining area divisions."

15           Suppose that Forest Hill is merged with  
16 one or more of the other municipalities in the area -  
17 I just said "suppose"; I do not know whether it will be  
18 or not - you would then have under your scheme, as I  
19 see it, a number of area divisions within the enlarged  
20 municipality. And the same thing would happen if the  
21 whole metropolitan area were amalgamated. You would  
22 have a number of area divisions.

23           How could these divisions be "responsive to  
24 its own area" and provide a different - I should not say  
25 different type of education, but provide differences in  
26 the educational service? Are you assuming that.....

27 Well, there obviously would have to be one tax rate  
28 within the area. Would it be possible for the division  
29 to have basic differences as compared with adjoining  
30 divisions?







1 MRS. GROSSBERG: I would sincerely hope so,  
2 Mr. Goldenberg, or I would feel that education would be  
3 set back a very long way, because it is certainly our  
4 feeling that the needs of the individual child and the  
5 needs of the special community must be met if you are  
6 going to have the type of school system where each child  
7 is treated in the same way and each child in the whole  
8 Metro area is treated in the same way with no consider-  
9 ation of the needs of that child. Then I would be very  
10 very much concerned.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but that is not  
12 what I was thinking of. I will be more specific.  
13 It has been said that standards in some respects anyway  
14 are higher or better in Forest Hill than some other  
15 school districts. Would it be possible under your  
16 system again with uniform taxation to maintain standards  
17 which could be higher if you are only one division within  
18 a larger area?

19 MR. GROSSBERG: I would hope so, Mr.  
20 Goldenberg. First of all, if I may, I would like to  
21 make one correction. It is not our feeling that schools  
22 in Forest Hill are better than other schools in the  
23 Metro area.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You have done certain  
25 things which others have not done. Perhaps others  
26 have done certain things which you have not.

27 MRS. GROSSBERG: Definitely. We feel what  
28 we have been able to do is provide for the needs of the  
29 children in our area. For instance it would be quite  
30 ridiculous for Forest Hill to provide a technical education





1 in Forest Hill. We just do not have the demand or the  
2 need for it. Under the Metropolitan school system we  
3 have been able to buy this kind of education for our  
4 children elsewhere and for this we are very appreciative.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Let me cite two figures  
6 to you. The education costs per pupil in 1962 in  
7 Forest Hill for public elementary pupils was \$570.00.  
8 In York it was \$409.00. Would it be possible to  
9 maintain a differential like that under a system of  
10 larger areas?

11 MR. GROSSBERG: I would doubt it. I  
12 would say, Mr. Goldenberg, part of the reason for that  
13 difference that you have quoted is that the number of  
14 students in the elementary schools in Forest Hill have  
15 been dropping quite rapidly so that this adds, of course,  
16 to our per pupil cost.

17 Perhaps Mr. Ouelette or Dr. Flower might  
18 add something to that.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I will just cite one  
20 other figure, because Mrs. Grossberg said the number of  
21 pupils in elementary schools has been declining. The  
22 academic per pupil cost in Forest Hill was \$763.00 and  
23 in York \$583.00. There is that differential. I only  
24 mentioned York because it is adjoining the municipality.

25 DR. FLOWER: Under the plan proposed by  
26 the Forest Hill Board there is no question but what  
27 fiscal control resides in the larger school board and  
28 the larger school system.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

30 DR. FLOWER: The proposal is for a consider-







1 able degree of decentralization of area school systems  
2 within such a larger fiscally responsible unit.

3 Clearly I would assume there would be the same tax rate  
4 from division to division within the larger unit.

5 Clearly I would assume the Board in its policy-making  
6 decisions for the entire larger unit would find itself  
7 very hard pressed indeed to spend substantially more for  
8 long per child than in another division unless very good  
9 reason could be shown as to why this should be done.

10           There might be various reasons. One  
11 reason for example would be that in one school division  
12 under the larger area you might have an extremely  
13 vigorous staff given the freedom to experiment and  
14 demonstrating the need to experiment and the possibilities  
15 of experimenting, such that the Board as a whole in its  
16 wisdom would be willing to go along with the somewhat  
17 higher cost of such experimentation for this one division  
18 in the hope that something might come out of this which  
19 would be applicable throughout the whole larger unit.

20           As it stands at the moment if you would  
21 have such divisional kinds of decentralization it be-  
22 comes a little more difficult, I think, to make  
23 decisions which are going to have to be put into effect  
24 throughout the whole larger school system. It is pos-  
25 sible to do this but a little more difficult.

26           New York City with its great and much  
27 maligned school system has been facing this kind of dif-  
28 ficulty and is only now attempting to decentralize in  
29 terms of setting up twenty-five district boards appointed  
30 by a central board of education each with a staff which





1 at the moment consists of one superintendent and a couple  
2 of clerks - so obviously it is not very effective in  
3 this regard.

4 Our hope would be that from the start one  
5 could set up possibilities here in the first place and  
6 in the second place one could have the intention, the  
7 willingness to decentralize rather than the intention, --  
8 the willingness to assume that all must be the same  
9 throughout the system. Again this could mean the kind  
10 of decentralization which would permit live people,  
11 both live professional people in divisional offices and  
12 schools within divisions.

13 The other invention, if you wish, of an  
14 educational council instead of the present school board  
15 with all the connotations that go along with the school  
16 board; we would have some hope that we could maintain  
17 in this way not only some of the advantages of large and  
18 small at the same time but also develop a situation  
19 where within one school division - not necessarily  
20 Forest Hill - you might well find considerably more  
21 dollars per pupil being spent than within some other  
22 school system. However, it is not only a matter of  
23 dollars.

24 I have one more point. Assuming the same  
25 number of dollars per pupil, one division in its wisdom  
26 and creativity might spend these dollars in a somewhat  
27 different way from that in which some other division  
28 might choose to spend these dollars. There is definitely  
29 a relationship between cost and quality in education  
30 just as there is in men's clothing or any other such







1 things. I think the ratio or relationship is not  
2 definitely a one-to-one relationship. If we tried to  
3 make it a one-to-one relationship in some enlarged  
4 school system we are ruling out the possibilities of  
5 developing a one-point-something-to-one division from  
6 the same dollar.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I have to give some  
8 consideration to dollars. I am not suggesting that  
9 \$400.00 per pupil in one school district means exactly  
10 the same type of education as \$400.00 spent in another.

11 I have had some views expressed to me pro  
12 and con a foundation programme either within new boroughs  
13 or covering the whole Metropolitan area. Would you have  
14 any views on that or will I ask Dr. Flower?

15 MRS. GROSSBERG: Mr. Goldenberg, as sug-  
16 gested in the study that the Metropolitan School Board  
17 made a few years ago----

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have read that  
19 study, yes. I was wondering whether the Forest Hill  
20 Board has any views on that, assuming the formation of  
21 larger units or one large unit?

22 MRS. GROSSBERG: I am not quite clear and  
23 I just cannot recall exactly what this particular  
24 foundation programme suggested. They have a foundation  
25 programme in the Province of Alberta. The new grant  
26 structure in the Province of Ontario is also called a  
27 foundation programme. I think they are quite quite  
28 different. Before answering that I would perhaps  
29 like a little clarification.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: A minimum programme







1 which I suppose would be related to certain expenditures  
2 for - a certain figure for teachers' salaries, maintenance  
3 and so on. I was wondering if Dr. Flower would have  
4 any views on that, bearing in mind the financial problem  
5 which you are not dealing with.

6 DR. FLOWER: I am not a fiscal expert by  
7 any manner of means.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: But on the educational  
9 side.

10 DR. FLOWER: My feeling about a foundation  
11 programme is that the Metro area is so inexplicably  
12 interwoven economically and sociologically, so inter-  
13 dependent one part of the area with another, that it  
14 becomes rather difficult to think of equalization to  
15 the extent that money can give you equalization only in  
16 terms of a foundation programme - which by definition  
17 has to be a minimum.

18 The problem is that a minimum is not good  
19 enough and this would leave one area, it seems to me -  
20 perhaps I should not say this, but I must - however  
21 creative one might be in carving up the various schemes  
22 of greater Toronto as we have it and greater Metro Toronto  
23 if we move beyond it, it would very difficult to result  
24 in a series of boroughs, of larger units which really  
25 would be equal in fiscal ability. So that to the extent  
26 they are not equal in fiscal ability then indeed you are  
27 not going as far as you can go in equalizing opportunity  
28 through money if you depend upon a foundation programme,  
29 because this is only a minimum.

30 The great advantage of it is that it permits





1 the remaining local authorities which you have, at what-  
2 ever level, to do what they wish and to move beyond  
3 where they are.

4 It seems to me, Mr. Commissioner, that in  
5 the Forest Hill proposal you may well find ways and means  
6 in the area divisions within your larger school divisions  
7 (whatever they may be called - larger school areas) so  
8 that some may well move beyond, and you may again have  
9 something of the advantage<sup>of</sup> having what in effect would be  
10 the standard tax rate rather than an equalization pro-  
11 gramme. It would be quite conceivable that the  
12 Greater Metro Board, if it were one, or the several  
13 larger Boards, if it were another, might within its own  
14 budgeting procedures provide some small measure of free  
15 money to the area director of education for expenditure  
16 in consultation with his own education council.

17 I would think this would be highly dangerous  
18 however because fiscal control in my view ought to be  
19 at the central office (a) to assure that the money is  
20 taken from where it is and spent where it needs to be  
21 spent and (b) so that some overall large-scale planning  
22 could be done rather than having some patchwork develop-  
23 ment as we have had throughout the Province in the past.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: The education councils  
25 that you suggest should be set up would be advisory only  
26 and the distinction between them and the existing school  
27 boards would be that they would have no administrative  
28 functions whereas the existing school boards have  
29 administrative functions.

30 MRS. GROSSBERG: Yes, sir. I would think







1 that the difference would be that the policies would be  
2 formed at the level of the larger unit board but the  
3 advice would<sup>be</sup>/sought from these education councils and  
4 they in turn would be responsive to the needs of their  
5 own sub-community.

6 As we have said in our brief they would be  
7 frankly an advisory group with emphasis on investigation,  
8 enquiry and communication with the local public. I  
9 would imagine that they would have a representation on  
10 the larger unit board through one of their members.

11 MR. OUELETTE: Mr. Commissioner, if I may  
12 make a point here, sir, I think the education council  
13 would serve to function.... Let me put it to you this  
14 way. The prime purpose would be communication between the  
15 local people and the schools in which their children are  
16 being educated. This we think is of prime importance.  
17 But in the natural course of events people so orientated  
18 with this type of philosophy would naturally gravitate  
19 towards the larger boards of education.

20 Let me illustrate this simply. It is not,  
21 I think, a coincidence that the first Mayor of Metro-  
22 politan Toronto graduated - if you want to call it that -  
23 from the position of Reeve of Forest Hill. The first  
24 Chairman of the Metropolitan School Board graduated -  
25 if I may use that term - from the position of Chairman  
26 of the Forest Hill board. The first overall Police  
27 Commissioner in Metropolitan Toronto when the Police  
28 force here was amalgamated was also a former Reeve of  
29 Forest Hill.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Does the Board of





1 Education take full credit for that?

2 MR. OUELETTE: I wish we could take full  
3 credit for that. It is not one of our accomplishments.  
4 But I think it is an accomplishment which is based on  
5 the philosophy which we here advocate. That is, when  
6 you get people who are orientated towards communication  
7 between the job that is being done and the people that  
8 are paying for it and are interested in it, then you get  
9 a good job done.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You have said that  
11 local school boards would be something of a sham because  
12 of the limited autonomy they would have under a central  
13 system. I was wondering why you were so confident  
14 that education councils which would be purely advisory  
15 could be effective or would be more effective?

16 MR. OUELETTE: Well, this may seem to be a  
17 semantic difference, sir. When you give a thing a name  
18 people usually associate or give a connotation to that  
19 name which it has previously had. If you call these  
20 "school boards" and take away the administrative functions  
21 we normally associate with school boards, then in the  
22 minds of a great many people - and indeed people who are  
23 aspiring to get onto these councils - there may be some  
24 misconceptions as to what their role really is, as indeed  
25 there are already misconceptions in the role of some  
26 trustees as to what the function of a trustee is.

27 Many people think - or some people, I  
28 should say, think that a trustee is put there to run the  
29 schools. Indeed he is not. He is put there to see  
30 the schools<sup>are</sup>/run, it is true, but it is not his function





1 to run the schools as such.

2 I think if you clearly state what the  
3 functions are and divorce it completely from the entire  
4 philosophy of an elected board with complete autonomy  
5 of administration matters, everybody would understand  
6 and people who would gravitate from this position would  
7 be people who were qualified with some background and  
8 initiative and people who have a different philosophy  
9 on education, and people who are sincerely interested  
10 in education.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You do not envisage  
12 the members of these education councils or some of them  
13 being also members of the Metropolitan Board or the  
14 central board, do you, because you could not very well  
15 have an advisory body advising another body which sets  
16 policy if members of the advisory body are also members  
17 of the other body?

18 DR. FLOWER: This is a very good point  
19 you raise. I would think it could be so. In the  
20 scheme as we have envisaged it every citizen, every  
21 ratepayer would have a vote for someone on the larger  
22 board of education.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Directly or indirectly?  
24 No, it would have to be directly.

25 DR. FLOWER: This would be directly. It  
26 should not be possible to elect - and there has been  
27 some thought on this and I think on the whole the  
28 members of the Board feel this would not be wise. The  
29 education committee - rather the education councils  
30 would be appointed, a series of them, and they would be  
appointed by the elected board of education.







1                   The people who would be appointed to  
2 those Councils would be the kind of people of whom  
3 Mr. Kertzer has spoken. Now these Councils would be  
4 advisory in all the centres.

5                   (1) They would be advisory to the  
6 member of the Board as an individual and to the Board  
7 of Education as an entity with reference to matters  
8 of concern to their particular division. There is a  
9 definite channel there. It is advisory. We would  
10 hope there would be ample communication.

11                  (2) They would be advisory to the  
12 Divisional Director of Education, who is, we hope,  
13 to be given a fair degree of freedom by his own  
14 Chief Director of Education, the Chief Executive Officer  
15 for the elected Board of Education.

16                  (3) They would be advisory, if you  
17 wish, or serve as a channel of communication to the  
18 ratepayers themselves, the various civic groups, the  
19 various multitudinous groups interested in schools  
20 locally, because indeed schools are a concern of all.

21                  Now, this is difficult to work out  
22 and when you say that the vestigial Board would be  
23 something of a sham would this not be more so? You  
24 take away the powers the Boards now have. I would like  
25 Mr. Kertzer's response. I feel this would be frankly  
26 advisory from the start, recognized as such. On the  
27 one hand, this would help where you have left vestigial  
28 Boards. As you know it has been faced in other  
29 jurisdictions and with satisfactory answer. It seems  
30 to me this new type of social invention might well get





1 away from some of the difficulties they have met with  
2 in Chicago and even rural Saskatchewan.

3                   This would not work out if you simply  
4 grafted it upon schools as we now have them and  
5 professionals in the school business as we now have  
6 them. The professionals who would have to work with  
7 these Councils would need to readjust their thinking  
8 to the potentially useful role of the Council. Time  
9 would have to be given to them and responsibility would  
10 have to be exacted from them to work with such Councils  
11 and see such Councils did indeed work.

12                   THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Dr. Flower.  
13 There is only one other question I want to put to you,  
14 Mrs. Grossberg: Is it your view there should be  
15 uniform teachers' salaries throughout the Metropolitan  
16 area?

17                   MRS. GROSSBERG: Yes, Mr. Goldenberg.  
18 If I may take just a few minutes to answer your  
19 question.

20                   THE COMMISSIONER: I mean the uniform  
21 scales.

22                   MRS. GROSSBERG: Yes, I quite under-  
23 stand. Before the unofficial Metropolitan Salary  
24 Committee was set up, Forest Hill had evolved a scheme  
25 whereby early in the fall the whole Board, plus the  
26 representatives of the staff met together and set up  
27 study committees. We divided up into various groups.  
28 There was a member of the Board on each one of the  
29 groups and we did really research studies into  
30 comparison of salaries in Forest Hill with other areas;







1 comparison of teachers' salaries with other provisions  
2 and there were some other things --

3 MR. OUELETTE: Mostly comparing the  
4 salaries all across the Province, the teachers in  
5 other professions, the cost of living.

6 MRS. GROSSBERG: The advantages and  
7 disadvantages of teaching in Forest Hill. Then we  
8 met together and presented reports of the committees  
9 and together we worked out a salary schedule. This was  
10 very pleasant working together. We spent a tremendous  
11 amount of time on it and so did the teachers, but we  
12 were all very happy with the results.

13 Then as members of the Metropolitan  
14 School Board we had agreed that we would cooperate  
15 with the other Boards in the area and we found after  
16 all these months of work that the salary schedule that  
17 we had evolved was below that of several other of the  
18 Boards.

19 We felt we were in this way being  
20 non-competitive and that we were not dealing with  
21 our teachers fairly, so we had to call the teachers  
22 back and say we are going to give you "X" more dollars  
23 and this was not very satisfactory.

24 We finally decided we would have to  
25 dispense with this because it was not serving any real  
26 purpose and we said we would go along, we set our  
27 salaries at the suggested schedule that the Metropolitan  
28 Salary Committee suggested.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: That is, you decided  
30 to dispense with your own internal studies and negotiations?





1 MRS. GROSSBERG: Yes. We had a very  
2 great deal of difficulty, and we are still having  
3 some difficulty, I would say, enabling our teachers  
4 to understand why we had to go along with Metro and  
5 why we couldn't just go on in our own autonomous way  
6 that we were happy with.

7 We felt this was our responsibility  
8 as part of Metro and the inter-relationship that Dr.  
9 Flower was talking about made it necessary that we go  
10 along. We were one of those at first who felt that  
11 we should not ask for legislation for uniform salaries  
12 from the Provincial Government, but after some of the  
13 things that happened last year and the year before, we  
14 decided that we would vote in favour of asking for  
15 legislation for uniform salaries across the Metro area.

16 We, of course, felt badly about giving  
17 up our own autonomy in this. We felt it was necessary  
18 for the good of the whole Metropolitan school system.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you agree that  
20 it is not desirable to allow one member of the School  
21 Board to establish either a different salary scale or  
22 additional bonuses and so on? I mean, was that the  
23 issue that led you to vote that way?

24 MRS. GROSSBERG: Yes.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You agree with what  
26 has been said to me about the Etobicoke Board, is that  
27 right?

28 MRS. GROSSBERG: I must say in their  
29 defence, sir, that this year they were very happy to go  
30 along with the rest of the Metropolitan area, but in the







1 past they have felt differently.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I want your  
3 reaction to this, Mrs. Grossberg. Etobicoke told  
4 me that it was not fair to pick up one item, even  
5 though it is an important item, the school expense,  
6 and make a decision on that basis. They said that one  
7 should look at the expenditures of each area Board  
8 on the various items. In other words, Etobicoke may,  
9 with its master system, or whatever they call it, may  
10 have something there which is additional to what other  
11 Boards do, but Etobicoke may incur less expense on some  
12 other items and it is unfair to pick on just the one  
13 item. What do you think?

14 MRS. GROSSBERG: I think I would be  
15 inclined to agree on that. I feel that each area  
16 has certain values and various needs. What is very  
17 important, for instance, in the City of Toronto might  
18 be of far lesser importance in a place like Forest  
19 Hill.

20 I am very much concerned about having  
21 everything uniform and uniformity across the Metro  
22 area as far as salaries are concerned. I think there  
23 should be certain limitations within which the Board  
24 has the power to act because it might be very necessary  
25 to have in a certain area a certain type of specialist  
26 and this would necessarily cost more and it might be  
27 necessary to pay a larger sum of money for the  
28 responsibility that this person was taking.

29 I would think within certainly the  
30 limits of minima and maxima there should be uniformity







1 across Metro.

2 DR. FLOWER: I have one reservation  
3 with respect to your question and this is not in  
4 any way meant as a criticism of Etobicoke, but  
5 the realities of the situation are this: The most  
6 important problem and the most pressing problem with  
7 every School Board is acquisition and maintenance,  
8 and maintaining or keeping of very well qualified  
9 teachers. While it might be arithmetically correct  
10 to say one must average costs out, if a particular  
11 Board does something in an area which is of prime  
12 importance in the thinking and the planning of another  
13 School Board, then, of course, the imbalance is not  
14 arithmetical at all. It is out of proportion to what  
15 the average cost of education in that particular  
16 community might be.

17 The reality of the situation is, of  
18 course, in any area where a strong academic programme  
19 is required by residents of that area, need for highly  
20 qualified specialist teachers is very great and if  
21 the thirteen municipalities of Toronto, or the eleven  
22 School Boards, will compete against each other in  
23 trying to get these people, obviously you are in an  
24 inflationary spiral which keeps going up and up and  
25 the truth of the matter is these things don't help  
26 anyhow. The other communities like Burlington and  
27 Hamilton merely top the top figures in Metro for the  
28 purpose of trying to drag off some of the specialist  
29 teachers which we want in the schools here in this area.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: If you had uniformity





1 are you satisfied that would distribute the teachers  
2 on the basis of the needs of the area? Would it  
3 not be possible, if you had uniformity, that the  
4 teachers might then decide they would sooner live  
5 in Scarboro and Etobicoke than Toronto?

6 MR. KERTZER: I am not sure I under-  
7 stand the question.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I am asking you  
9 this: The whole problem of teachers' salaries, about  
10 which I have been hearing, arises from the scarcity of  
11 qualified teachers for secondary schools. Now you  
12 recommend a uniform scale. Might not a teacher feel  
13 that he or she would just as soon teach in Scarboro  
14 or Etobicoke than Toronto if the salary is the same?  
15 He might prefer living conditions there. Problems  
16 might be easier for his family.

17 MR. KERTZER: Of course where a teacher  
18 lives doesn't necessarily have an immediate effect on  
19 where he teaches. The fact of the matter is in Forest  
20 Hill the teacher generally likes to work in the place  
21 where he feels some of the accomplishment of his own  
22 goals, as Dr. Flower and Mrs. Grossberg talked about.  
23 It seems to me the uniform schedule will not solve the  
24 problem of acquiring specialist teachers. It will  
25 solve the problem of acute competition for those that  
26 are available and I think that is all it is intended  
27 to solve.

28 I should not like to go into the matter  
29 of what impels people to become teachers and specialist  
30 teachers. I think there are other reasons having







1 nothing at all to do with what we are discussing  
2 today. I would be glad to go into my own views on  
3 that at some other time.

4 If I may repeat, the purpose of the  
5 uniform salary schedule was a very specific one, to  
6 eliminate the acute competition for the number of  
7 specialist teachers who were available in this area.

8 MRS. GROSSBERG: Mr. Goldenberg,  
9 actually in fact we have really had more or less a  
10 uniform salary schedule in the Metropolitan area.  
11 I don't think it has made much difference as to where  
12 teachers teach. I would think that in most cases  
13 they teach in those areas where they feel they can  
14 fulfill their needs and also give the kind of service  
15 they would like to give.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: And perhaps where  
17 there is more chance of promotion?

18 MRS. GROSSBERG: That is another thing.  
19 As a matter of fact that has been one of our difficulties  
20 in Forest Hill, being a small school system, we have  
21 become more or less a training ground for the fast  
22 growing municipalities but actually, as I said before,  
23 it was a problem but we are very happy to be able to  
24 give this kind of service and we have found no  
25 difficulty whatsoever in replacing those teachers who  
26 go on to take positions of more responsibility in  
27 other places.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
29 Mrs. Grossberg, for an interesting brief. I will now  
30 adjourn until Tuesday morning, May the 5th, at 10:00 A.M.



**ROYAL COMMISSION**

**ON**

**METROPOLITAN  
TORONTO**

**HEARINGS**

**HELD AT**

**PARLIAM. BLDG.  
TORONTO**

**VOLUME No. DATE:**

**7 MAY 5th 1964.**

**OFFICIAL REPORTERS**

**ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO**

**364-5865 364-7383**





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1  
2  
3 ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
4

5 Hearings of the Royal Commission  
6 on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
7 the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
8 Ontario, on Tuesday, May 5, 1964,  
9 commencing at 10.00 a.m., et seq.  
10

11  
12  
13 COMMISSION:  
14

15 H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C., Chairman

16 F. H. Finnis Secretary

17 L. Feldman Research Officer

18 T. Plunkett Municipal Consultant  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30







ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1  
2  
3 ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
4

5 Hearings of the Royal Commission  
6 on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
7 the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
8 Ontario, on Tuesday, May 5, 1964,  
9 commencing at 10.00 a.m., et seq.  
10

11  
12  
13 COMMISSION:  
14

15 H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C., Chairman

16 F. H. Finnis Secretary

17 L. Feldman Research Officer

18 T. Plunkett Municipal Consultant  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, TOWN OF LEASIDE	674-687
NORTH YORK BOARD OF EDUCATION	688-712
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, VILLAGE OF SWANSEA	713-717
BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH	718-740
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF YORK	741-767

\* \* \* \* \*







1 THE COMMISSIONER: The Leaside Board  
2 of Education, Mr. Mist.  
3

4 SUBMISSION OF  
5 THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
6 TOWN OF LEASIDE

7 Appearances:

8 Charles F. Mist	Chairman
9 A. L. Abrahams	Business Administrator
10 M. L. Holmes	Superintendent of
11	Public Schools and
12	Secretary-Treasurer
13 Mrs. Betty Strang	Vice-Chairman
14 F. C. Hill	Trustee
15 D. Pittet	Trustee

16  
17  
18 MR. MIST: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.  
19 It is a pleasure to be here this morning and speak to  
20 our brief that we have submitted. With your permis-  
21 sion I would like to introduce one or two of our  
22 trustees, who are here, and also our Secretary and  
23 Business Administrator. We have Mrs. Betty Strang,  
24 Trustee, Trustee Mr. Hill, Trustee Pittet, Mr.  
25 M. L. Holmes, our Superintendent of Public Schools  
26 and Secretary-Treasurer, and Mr. Abrahams, our  
27 Business Administrator.

28 Mr. Commissioner, the Leaside Board of  
29 Education having reviewed and considered all the facts  
30 and figures leading up to the presentation of this





1 brief, we wish at this time to go on record as  
2 strongly opposing amalgamation with the City of Toronto  
3 in any form.

4 The Town of Leaside came into being on  
5 May 7, 1913. At that time we had a population of 43  
6 people. Today we have close to 19,000 in population.  
7 In 1929 Leaside had 15 industrial and commercial  
8 buildings. Today we have close to 530. The early  
9 sapling planted in 1913 has spread into a vigorous  
10 and well-formed useful tree.

11 It is not very difficult to pin-point the  
12 reason for Leaside's success. To live in Leaside  
13 is to realize the tremendous community spirit which  
14 is inevitable. Citizens respond to all areas of  
15 voluntary cooperation and give liberally of their  
16 time and talents.

17 Leaside's march to educational efficiency  
18 has been determined, direct and dramatic. In 1920  
19 we had 43 pupils and one teacher, and started out  
20 in a borrowed cafeteria. Now we have over \$3,500,000  
21 in evaluation in educational facilities.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Forty-three seems to  
23 be your lucky number.

24 MR. MIST: Yes.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I notice the town was  
26 incorporated with a population of 43.

27 MR. MIST: That is true. We have now  
28 3,000 pupils and 135 teachers. Leaside has four  
29 public schools that are a satisfaction to our rate-  
30 payers. To the best of our knowledge they function





1 efficiently, and we believe economically.

2 The first school was built in 1923. It  
3 is named Bessborough. Rolph Road school was  
4 built in 1938, followed by Northlea School in 1942.  
5 In 1962 we added our last public school, Thorncliffe.

6 The high school which we have was built  
7 in 1945. It has had several additions added thereto  
8 over the years, and in September, 1963, we opened a  
9 large vocational wing. To this efficient building  
10 set-up has been added a group of loyal teachers. The  
11 esprit de corps with our teachers and our staff in  
12 our opinion is beyond the ordinary. We have an  
13 excellent educational organization.

14 In Leaside no one objects to putting up  
15 money for libraries or instruments for the high school  
16 band, rinks for youngsters, tennis courts. We are  
17 almost crime free. Our boast is that we are a  
18 decent middle class people who hold our jobs and pay  
19 our debts.

20 The organization called Metropolitan  
21 Toronto was hailed by many as a great step forward  
22 in city planning and thinking, and it was with some  
23 trepidation that Leaside became a member of the  
24 Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. It is our  
25 considered opinion after an eleven-year period that  
26 the Corporation of Metropolitan government has  
27 functioned exceedingly well. Much has been accomp-  
28 lished, and the so-called "have not" communities have  
29 been assisted and aided by many millions of dollars  
30 which heretofore they did not have.







1                   There is admiration throughout North  
2 America, the United Kingdom and Europe for the form  
3 of metropolitan government inaugurated in Toronto on  
4 January 1st, 1954. Three years ago it was my  
5 pleasure to visit several countries in Europe, and  
6 several people mentioned our metropolitan form of  
7 government. They spoke of it with knowledge, and  
8 it appeared to them as being a desirable form of  
9 government.

10                   The amalgamationists by and large are the  
11 politicians of the City of Toronto who believe that  
12 one big city approach would best enhance the image  
13 of the city and                   its future developments.  
14 The newspapers have never in my humble opinion  
15 accepted Metro as anything but a stage or a step  
16 on the road to complete amalgamation.

17                   In the late 1940's and early 1950's  
18 when population was growing in the Metro area, sewage  
19 disposal was inadequate. There were thousands of  
20 septic tank installations throughout the area, and  
21 this posed a real threat to public health and sani-  
22 tation.

23                   Keeping in mind the mushrooming population  
24 in the suburbs, it caused considerable heart searching  
25 for funds with which to build schools. It was at  
26 this time that our federated metropolitan government  
27 was born, and we submit that this crisis has never  
28 been solved by the creation of Metro.

29                   If amalgamation is the only step which is  
30 to be accepted, the other areas such as Markham, Peel





1 County, Pickering Township and others should be amal-  
2 gamated with Metro to give these less privileged  
3 children so-called equalized education. We submit  
4 that the important decision of amalgamation should  
5 be by the choice or vote of the people and not of the  
6 politicians. In the case of Leaside a house to house  
7 survey was conducted in 1963 which showed 95.68  
8 per cent completely opposed to amalgamation.

9 The Metropolitan government has not yet  
10 in our opinion finished its task by any means. In  
11 particular, the opportunity to create a reasonably  
12 adequate stock of public low-rental housing for  
13 families, and the urgency to develop a widely  
14 accepted reasonably official plan for the Metro-  
15 politan Toronto planning area.

16 It is said amalgamation reduces costs  
17 for public health, fire protection, but to refute  
18 this argument one has only to point out the increase  
19 of 41 per cent in the cost of the unified police  
20 administration in Metropolitan Toronto from 1957 to  
21 1961 inclusive. And it is rising still. Magistrate  
22 C. L. Bick, Chairman of the Police Commission, in  
23 his annual report noted that the cost of police work  
24 has risen from \$15 million in 1957 to nearly \$20  
25 million in 1963.

26 To say that amalgamation would cut costs  
27 in our opinion is not so or is not true. Senior  
28 officials require additional remuneration by virtue  
29 of their substantially increased responsibility, and  
30 in all likelihood would require assistants and







1 assistants to the assistants.

2           There are those who argue the City of  
3 Toronto has remedial reading, speech correction schools,  
4 schools for the hard of hearing, and so on and so  
5 forth; that other so-called "have not" communities  
6 do not have any special services at all and cannot  
7 afford them. They will argue that these should be  
8 spread over the whole of the Metropolitan area. Mr.  
9 Commissioner we submit that special services such as  
10 remedial reading, speech correction, et cetera,  
11 should not only be available to the whole of the  
12 Metropolitan area but should also be the concern  
13 of the provincial government. We believe those  
14 services should be available in every city and town  
15 in Ontario as well as in Toronto, of course.

16           There are those in the larger municipali-  
17 ties who favour a borough system, or in other words  
18 they are willing to take all they can get, but hands  
19 off attitude; don't touch us.

20           Leaside enjoys an enviable position, due  
21 primarily to the early planners in laying out the  
22 town who invited industry to participate. This has  
23 resulted in 54 per cent industrial as against 46 per  
24 cent residential assessment.

25           One has only to look at what the metro-  
26 politan government has accomplished and one can  
27 realize what a tremendous past it has and future it  
28 can look forward to. The present Metro Chairman  
29 William Allen said in his inaugural address on January  
30 14 of this year that the Metropolitan government is not





1 ready for the scrap heap. Former Metro Toronto  
2 Chairman Frederick Gardiner, in his speech in  
3 December, 1963, stated that amalgamation of Metro  
4 Toronto municipalities would be a tragic mistake  
5 resulting in administrative indigestion. Mr. Gardiner  
6 pointed out that Metro has accomplished wonders, and  
7 would continue to do so in the years ahead.

8 In 1963 the Metropolitan School Board  
9 recommended complete amalgamation of the entire area  
10 with 22 trustees.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: It was not the School  
12 Board as such.

13 MR. MIST: It was the Metropolitan School  
14 Board, sir.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Was it not, rather,  
16 a special committee that recommended that to the  
17 Board, that the Board adopt that?

18 MR. MIST: It is my understanding, sir,  
19 that this committee was appointed by the Metropolitan  
20 School Board, and then they produced this report.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

22 MR. MIST: What was done with the report  
23 then I could not answer. Eighty-seven trustees  
24 would be put out to pasture if this were the case.  
25 Paid officials will of necessity replace the trustees  
26 who at present give freely of their time at no cost  
27 to the community. Unfortunately, the report  
28 at any stage does not contain any suggestions that  
29 intimate there will be a reduction in cost.

30 I believe as in any business venture, when





1 we talk of mergers we usually talk of reduced operating  
2 costs. This is I think one of the basic business  
3 approaches in mergers.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you consider educa-  
5 tion a business venture?

6 MR. MIST: It is in this respect: we do  
7 have to keep our taxes as low as possible. We believe  
8 that the Metro School Board can continue to do a very  
9 competent job. We feel that the so-called rich areas  
10 would endorse additional assistance to any local  
11 school board in the Metropolitan area which can show  
12 justification for such assistance.

13 At this point, Mr. Commissioner, we might  
14 say a few words regarding teachers' salaries. Leaside's  
15 experience has been one of complete understanding and  
16 cooperation. We have kept between the minimums and  
17 maximums recommended by the various Metropolitan  
18 School Boards, and this has met with the complete  
19 agreement of our teachers.

20 In New York City in 1961 all local school  
21 boards were eliminated, and a new central board of  
22 education was formed. In a very short time the  
23 new board was buried in a mountain of problems, and  
24 the system has now been decentralized, and is being  
25 operated very effectively by 25 school boards.

26 It has been argued that the educational  
27 resources of the whole of the Metropolitan Toronto area  
28 should be made available equally to all children. In  
29 part we concur with the argument, providing it is  
30 necessary. The richer areas should contribute to those







1 less endowed, and this can be done without betraying  
2 the trust that was given to us under Bill 80, and  
3 by keeping the 11 areas intact.

4 Equality of education is a topic that could  
5 be discussed pro and con. Everyone is interested in  
6 paying their fair share to see that each child is  
7 given the best opportunity possible of acquiring a  
8 good education.

9 The case against total amalgamation rests  
10 on two bases. First, the proponents of amalgamation  
11 in our opinion have failed to demonstrate that the  
12 weaknesses are that Metropolitan Toronto as a  
13 form of government are sufficiently serious to war-  
14 rant its dissolution in favour of the unitary approach.  
15 The proponents of successful centralization have  
16 failed to demonstrate that many additional services  
17 require metropolitan administration.

18 Democracy in Canada is more than a right  
19 to vote. Democracy is a way of living for free and  
20 upright people who take pride in governing not only  
21 their country and their city but themselves. The  
22 challenge does not lie in the creation of a vast  
23 city in our opinion of several million people. Thank  
24 you, sir.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I have a few questions  
26 on your brief unless somebody in your delegation wants  
27 to add to what you have said.

28 MR. MIST: I do not think there is any-  
29 thing to be added at this time, sir. I will try  
30 and answer your questions.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 11, the lower  
2 half of the page, you say "We believe that certain  
3 changes could be made in representation at the Metro  
4 level." "There should be somewhat the same plan of  
5 voting system enforced in the Metropolitan School  
6 Board."

7 I am not clear as to the plan of voting  
8 system to which you refer there.

9 MR. MIST: May I call on Mr. Abrahams?

10 MR. ABRAHAMS: Mr. Commissioner, that is  
11 based on population representation, and as far as the  
12 Metropolitan School Board, a representative from one  
13 of the smaller boards in the Metro area would be  
14 entitled to one vote as compared with the represen-  
15 tative of some of the larger boards, excluding the  
16 City of Toronto, who also have just one vote at  
17 the Metropolitan School Board level.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: You say "There should  
19 be somewhat the same plan of voting system enforced  
20 in the Metropolitan School Board." What plan are  
21 you referring to?

22 MR. ABRAHAMS: Well, if you look at the  
23 paragraph before that, "We believe that certain changes  
24 could be made in representation at the Metro level.  
25 Certainly it is undeniable that the reeve of a small  
26 town of 11,000 or 9,000 should not have the same vote  
27 as the reeve of a great municipality which represents  
28 275,000 or 500,000 people."







1 It is a question merely of equalizing  
2 the voting of the Metro School Board. Whereas the  
3 suburbs at the moment just have one vote apiece,  
4 I believe the City of Toronto have eleven -- or half  
5 the voting strength of the Metropolitan School Board.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting the  
7 larger municipalities should have more votes than the  
8 small ones; is that right?

9 MR. ABRAHAMS: That is right.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: At the end of that page  
11 on the last line you say: "Certain financial redistri-  
12 bution must be made." Have you any ideas as to how  
13 that financial redistribution should be made for  
14 financing schools?

15 MR. MIST: I do not personally have a  
16 recommendation at this time. I feel that it would  
17 be a problem that the Metropolitan government or  
18 School Board at least should appoint a committee and  
19 vote on this point.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought I heard you  
21 refer to the politicians in Toronto as being the people  
22 responsible for promoting amalgamation?

23 MR. MIST: Yes, sir.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Are the politicians  
25 confined to the City of Toronto?

26 MR. MIST: I would say my honest opinion  
27 is that largely amalgamation has been (to use the  
28 term) talked out through the press by Toronto City  
29 politicians. I am thinking now over a several year  
30 period.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: At page 15 you refer  
2 to the growth which Leaside has experienced over the  
3 years and you say: "Large areas such as North York  
4 and Etobicoke and small areas such as Forest Hill  
5 and Leaside had similar problems in the past, but,  
6 through capable management and adequate planning,  
7 they were able to overcome their individual diffi-  
8 culties."

9 Are you suggesting there that such muni-  
10 cipalities as have financial problems now would be  
11 able to overcome their difficulties on their own  
12 through capable management and adequate planning?

13 MR. MIST: I believe so, sir. I think  
14 you could take Scarborough as an instance. I believe  
15 they have the land available for buildings and in  
16 time I would suggest that if they continue as no  
17 doubt they are to encourage commercial and manu-  
18 facturing, this will help them in their factories.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you not think  
20 that the rate of expansion in recent years and the  
21 continued rate of expansion today is far greater  
22 than the rate of expansion when Leaside was growing  
23 up?

24 MR. MIST: It is greater today, but I also  
25 feel that there is an influx more today of capital  
26 for commercial and manufacturing plants. I would  
27 say that it is as great today as it ever was.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: I was just going to  
29 suggest it is a little more difficult to meet the  
30 problems of today because of the very marked rate of





1 growth as compared with the expansion in the years when  
2 Leaside grew up.

3 MR. MIST: We have had some expansion  
4 too in these last two or three years through Thorncliffe.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: At page 23 you have  
6 the heading "Choice of Residence," and you state  
7 as one of the advantages of the present set-up that  
8 people have an opportunity when moving into Metro-  
9 politan Toronto to choose one of eleven school areas  
10 in which to reside each offering a different system of  
11 education.

12 Considering the ability of the population  
13 within the Metropolitan area do you think it is a good  
14 thing that a child moving from one municipality in  
15 the area to another has to face a different system  
16 of education?

17 MR. MIST: I do not think, Mr. Commis-  
18 sioner, that the general basis has very much differ-  
19 ence. In my own family we have moved from Montreal  
20 to Toronto City proper, back to Montreal and then to  
21 Leaside and we did not encounter any serious diffi-  
22 culties.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You are just trying to  
24 cater to me by mentioning Montreal.

25 MR. MIST: No. I use that as an illus-  
26 tration.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I was thinking of the  
28 differences within Metro where I have been given to  
29 understand there is a tri-level system in one munici-  
30 pality, and a two-level system in another, and that







1 may create problems. You do not think so?

2 MR. MIST: I do not think so, Mr. Com-  
3 missioner.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: I wanted your opinion  
5 on that.

6 MR. MIST: Yes. I do not think so.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: I think this is all I  
8 have to ask. Thank you very much.

9 MR. MIST: Thank you very kindly.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





SUBMISSION OF  
NORTH YORK BOARD OF EDUCATION

Appearances:

Mr. Robert D. G. Stanbury	Chairman
Mr. F. Minkler	Director of Education
Dr. H. R. Partlow	Superintendent of Public Schools
Mr. D. L. Tuff	Superintendent of Secondary Schools
Mr. W. Busch	Superintendent of Population Research

MR. STANBURY: Mr. Commissioner, my name is Stanbury, Chairman of the North York Board of Education. I would like to introduce to you a number of our North York officials -- the Director of Education, Dr. F. Minkler, who was educational adviser to the Hope Commission, you may be interested to know; our Superintendent of Public Schools, Dr. H. R. Partlow; Superintendent of Secondary Schools, Mr. D. L. Tuff, and our Superintendent of Population Research, Mr. Wayne Busch -- a very important job in an area such as North York.

The Board of Education for the Township of North York appreciates this opportunity to present a brief to you, and it is a pleasure for me to do so on behalf of the Board.

I note that the Metropolitan press believes







1 that you have been exposed to an almost uninterrupted  
2 parade of petty politicians spouting parochialism.  
3 If espousal of something short of total amalgamation  
4 qualifies us for such a description I am afraid this  
5 will be more of the same.

6 We must confess we do not find amalgama-  
7 tion irresistible as do some. I suppose we should  
8 feel guilty about that, but we do not. We are not  
9 here however to indulge in recriminations either about  
10 the practices or prejudices of other boards. We  
11 are not here to preserve our petty kingdom -- if the  
12 third largest education authority in Canada can  
13 be so described -- although we find much in it worthy  
14 of preservation. We harbour no territorial ambi-  
15 tions. We covet not our neighbours' children. As  
16 it is, we have almost 70,000 of our own in our schools.

17 Reference was made earlier to some  
18 municipalities not wanting to be disturbed. We  
19 have not come here asking that you do not disturb  
20 us. We appreciate there may have to be boundary  
21 changes and we are quite prepared to accept the  
22 necessity for these if you so recommend.

23 We do appreciate the opportunity to  
24 place before you in our brief some facts and feelings  
25 which have been unanimously agreed upon by the members  
26 of the North York Board of Education.

27 We have noted in our brief that the active  
28 interests of the community in the schools has been  
29 characteristic of the people of Ontario for almost  
30 175 years. Although the scope of education has





1 been broadened, the form of administration modified,  
2 and provincial support increased, the success of the  
3 educational system throughout Ontario is based upon  
4 the interest and willingness of the citizens to  
5 support local education through payment of local  
6 taxes, and through personal service on the boards of  
7 local schools.

8 We recognize that the accomplishments  
9 of the Metropolitan form of government and with the  
10 Metropolitan School Board have been exceptional.  
11 Certainly we in North York realize that by ourselves  
12 we could not have carried out our responsibilities  
13 in the establishment of our educational system.

14 Metro averted the crisis of accommodation  
15 which loomed up in 1953 and made possible the financing  
16 of our huge suburban school expansion of the past  
17 decade. But a year and a half ago we concluded  
18 that the time had come for realistic appraisal of  
19 the purpose and function of the Metropolitan School  
20 Board and of the local Boards of Education and we  
21 petitioned the Ontario government for such an  
22 appraisal by a commission such as yours.

23 We in North York have experienced a torrent  
24 of growth in the past ten years accommodating each  
25 year a net influx of about 5,000 pupils. In the  
26 eye of this human hurricane our educational system in  
27 North York has exhibited unprecedented development  
28 and it is now one of the three largest and we believe  
29 one of the best in Canada.

30 This could not have been accomplished without





1 the support of Metropolitan government. During that  
2 period the North York Board has developed certain  
3 unique and valuable educational programmes including  
4 the institution of our own tri-level system. This  
5 could not have been accomplished without local autonomy.

6 I think if you will permit me, Mr.  
7 Commissioner, I would like to make special reference  
8 for a few minutes to our tri-level system, because  
9 I know you are interested in this facet of education  
10 in Metropolitan Toronto. This is a facet of our  
11 system of which we are particularly proud and jealous  
12 of its retention.

13 Shortly after formation of the Board of  
14 Education for the Township of North York on January  
15 1st, 1954, it became apparent that the trustees  
16 faced an unparalleled expansion of school buildings  
17 and facilities to meet the needs of Canada's fastest  
18 growing community. The Board realized it had the  
19 opportunity and the challenge to plan with common  
20 sense, vision and courage a total educational system.

21 After several months of serious considera-  
22 tion the Board on June 28th, 1956, formally adopted  
23 the tri-level system of education, comprising public  
24 schools, junior high schools and secondary schools,  
25 which has become an outstanding feature of the North  
26 York educational system, and which it shares with  
27 Forest Hill and East York in Metropolitan Toronto.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Are those the only  
29 three that have the tri-level system?

30 MR. STANBURY: They are not the only







1 three that have the tri-level system, sir, but the  
2 only three that have the tri-level system involving  
3 junior high schools which bridge the gap between public  
4 and secondary schools.

5 It might be interesting to note here that  
6 the junior high school system as opposed to the  
7 senior public school system is more highly developed  
8 in Metropolitan Toronto. There are more junior  
9 high schools in Metropolitan Toronto than there are  
10 senior public schools.

11 The City of Toronto and the Township of  
12 Etobicoke, for instance, have senior public schools  
13 but not as many as there are junior high schools in  
14 the three areas which have them. North York alone  
15 now has 13 junior high schools and within a year we  
16 will have 16.

17 This was an example of educational plan-  
18 ning at a time in the midst of pressures of phenomenal  
19 growth and the need for stringent economy. It is  
20 obvious, of course, that the best time to design  
21 a total educational system was in this early stage  
22 of development. It is equally obvious that even the  
23 most judicious planning on such a wide basis cannot  
24 succeed without complete understanding and active  
25 support of the community and without local autonomy  
26 in educational administration.

27 In North York junior high schools com-  
28 prising grades 7, 8 and 9 provide the most appro-  
29 priate educational environment, we believe, for the  
30 early adolescent and at the same time permit the





1 elementary school and the secondary school to perform  
2 their functions more precisely in terms of the needs of  
3 their students.

4 In addition the junior high school is  
5 so constituted that it provides an ideal transition  
6 from the elementary school to the senior school and  
7 has permitted the development of a philosophy of  
8 education expressed in terms of the needs of the  
9 individual and one in which education is viewed as  
10 a continuum from kindergarten to university entrance.

11 It is most probable that without the  
12 local autonomy presently assured our Board the further  
13 development of the tri-level system as we know it and  
14 value it would be in jeopardy or so drastically  
15 modified that its present purposes would be unattain-  
16 able.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you just  
18 elaborate on that? Why do you think that would  
19 happen?

20 MR. STANBURY: One can only speculate as  
21 to the result of one single Board setting educational  
22 policy for all of Metropolitan Toronto. But perhaps  
23 it is reasonable to expect that that Board would  
24 attempt to standardize its schools, all the schools  
25 under its jurisdiction and think the City of Toronto  
26 in particular, while I think it has admired and  
27 coveted the junior high school system, has found in  
28 a built-up system it is difficult or impossible to  
29 make the change which we were able to make at the  
30 beginning of the building of an educational system.







1 So it is difficult to foresee the City of Toronto  
2 itself ever being able to institute a junior high  
3 school system without a great deal of expense.

4 But in North York it was possible and  
5 indeed irresistible for the trustees to institute  
6 such a system because they were able to build it  
7 from scratch. If under a borough system additional  
8 partly developed areas were added to Metro in the  
9 future I would hope that they too would have this  
10 opportunity rather than being amalgamated with a  
11 built-up area which has an educational system diffi-  
12 cult to change.

13 I would like to file with you, Mr.  
14 Commissioner, a booklet and a newsletter which the  
15 North York Board of Education distributed at the  
16 beginning of the junior high school system as an  
17 illustration of the importance that North York has  
18 always attached to keeping in close communication  
19 with the people who support the system -- the im-  
20 portance of the support of the local citizens in  
21 their school system. Perhaps it may assist you  
22 in understanding our junior high school system and  
23 the reasons for it.

24 At the same time there may be some  
25 statistical information of help to you in a study to  
26 determine the need for technical education in North  
27 York, which was prepared under the supervision of  
28 Dr. Louis Beatty on a commission from our Board about  
29 a year ago, and presented to the Minister of Education.

30 It is the considered judgment of this





1 Board that the Metropolitan system of government in  
2 so far as it affects education has been most success-  
3 ful and that it can be modified to meet effectively  
4 the present problems of administration and finance  
5 and to provide adequately for the future development  
6 of education within Metropolitan Toronto.





1                   We believe one essential modification is  
2   to make the composition of the Metropolitan School  
3   Board representative.   This has already been referred  
4   to this morning, Mr. Commissioner.   There can no longer  
5   be justification for our ten thousand friends in  
6   Swansea, for instance, having the same representation  
7   as the three hundred thousand in North York or the  
8   one hundred thousand children in Toronto schools being  
9   represented by ten members while North York's 68,000  
10   school children are represented by one.

11                  The Toronto members of the Metropolitan  
12   School Board have often acted with the highest sense  
13   of responsibility to all the children of Metro but  
14   it would surely demand of them the wisdom of Solomon  
15   and the compassion of a saint to expect them con-  
16   sistently to take the Metropolitan view to the  
17   prejudice of their own electors.   They have been  
18   by and large to their credit benevolent dictators,  
19   but nonetheless dictators by force of statute.

20                  We must admit to a feeling that it would  
21   be only perpetuated and extended by total amalgamation.  
22   Proponents of one big educational system often talk  
23   as if Toronto were a large, efficient school board  
24   which should absorb ten small inadequate ones.   But  
25   North York, as has been pointed out, is the third  
26   largest school authority in Canada; Toronto, incidentally,  
27   being only the second, not the first.           And  
28   Scarborough and Etobicoke too are among the nation's  
29   largest school systems.   None of these Boards, at  
30   least, is suffering from lack of size or inability to







1 provide a full range of educational services. Each  
2 of these three large suburban boards is struggling  
3 with problems which tax the ingenuity of educationalists  
4 and elected trustees who are familiar with local pro-  
5 blems and devote a great deal of time to solving them.

6 To lump all these problems together and  
7 hand over their solutions to one massive board could  
8 not help but result in more and more educational  
9 policy-making, as well as administration falling into  
10 the hands of a civil service of school officials. The  
11 present democratic method, whereby school officials  
12 are just kept constantly informed of the educational  
13 aims and resources of the community by elected  
14 trustees, would, surely be weakened. Whenever  
15 education retreated into an ivory tower it has lost  
16 its effectiveness in serving the needs of society.  
17 We are concerned that creation of a single huge  
18 educational authority in Metro would build such an  
19 ivory tower.

20 After serious consideration we contend  
21 that the complete amalgamation of all educational  
22 services within the Metropolitan community under  
23 one single educational authority would be a grievous  
24 error. We do, however, suggest the necessity of  
25 establishing local education authorities in boroughs  
26 large enough to provide the financial and population  
27 bases essential to the development of the modern  
28 urban educational system.

29 It is our contention that serious inequali-  
30 ties in the financial support for education in local





1 areas within Metropolitan Toronto can be overcome by  
2 the institution of a foundation tax programme. It  
3 is, indeed, the foundation programme which is the  
4 basis of the equalization of costs in all areas where  
5 there are rich and poor within the same wide organiza-  
6 tion. This is the general principle on which the  
7 legislative grants of the Department of Education are  
8 based.

9 The borough system provides economic and  
10 orderly government for a metropolitan area without  
11 submerging local identity and character. It permits  
12 innovation in procedures and programmes and this is of  
13 particular importance to an educational system.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: What happens to the  
15 identity of areas which are consolidated into a  
16 borough?

17 MR. STANBURY: I feel that in the amalga-  
18 mation of educational systems something will be lost;  
19 whether it is the educational system of Leaside, of  
20 Swansea, of Scarborough, of North York, of Etobicoke,  
21 or Toronto, something will be lost in the submerging  
22 of each of these educational systems in another.

23 I think we appreciate it is very difficult  
24 for many Boards who are more severely affected, for  
25 instance, by the borough system. We appreciate that  
26 there is advantage to a certain bigness, that there  
27 is a size at which an educational system is able to  
28 provide all educational services which these children  
29 require.

30 I think that perhaps even under the present







1 Metropolitan School Board similar educational services  
2 can be provided by the larger Boards to the smaller  
3 Boards without any amalgamation.

4 We are looking at the organization of  
5 Metropolitan Toronto certainly from a North York stand-  
6 point and it would be difficult for me to argue the  
7 case of Swansea, Leaside, or East York. I do believe  
8 that in the submerging of any of these systems some-  
9 thing that is good will be lost because I do believe  
10 that the opportunity for some innovation by the people  
11 who are building their educational system is very impor-  
12 tant.

13 The borough system organization does not  
14 sacrifice citizen interest and participation, which  
15 are social values directly related to the ability of  
16 the individual citizen to identify himself with that  
17 part of government which is closest to him and to his  
18 family.

19 Of course, we are speaking of the situation  
20 in North York. It may very well sacrifice to some  
21 extent the citizen interest and participation in  
22 Swansea and Leaside.

23 The borough system provides flexibility  
24 for future development; new areas could be added with-  
25 out reference to the expense of urbanization of the  
26 new borough and with little disturbance to the  
27 established Metropolitan organization.

28 On the other hand, amalgamation is a  
29 drastic measure. It is final, inflexible, and irrevoc-  
30 able. The pride and stimulation of local initiative





would be stifled. Policy-making would become more a factor of administration than an expression of community needs. A single Board of Education for the entire Metropolitan area is not politically practical. Either the Board would itself be so large as to be cumbersome and unwieldy or each trustee would be required to represent a constituency so large that an election campaign could be financed only with the support of a political party. In our considered judgment, therefore, total amalgamation of educational services in this area is a danger of such magnitude that it should not be entertained.

The Board of Education for the Township of North York respectfully recommends that modification of the Metropolitan form of educational administration include the establishment of a borough system with a Foundation tax plan, and the strengthening and extension of the responsibilities and powers of the Metropolitan School Board. The basic principles on which these modifications and changes should be effected are, we suggest:

(1) The local education authority should be designed, wherever feasible, in terms of the financial and population bases required by the modern urban educational system. It is recognized that, in certain instances, financial assistance may be necessary to a local board which can be provided through the Foundation tax plan or that special educational arrangements may be necessary to a local board which can be provided by cooperation with other





boards through the Metropolitan School Board.

THE COMMISSIONER: What do you envisage by the Foundation Tax plan?

MR. STANBURY: Well, I think, Mr. Commissioner, in the report submitted to you by the Metropolitan School Board there is quite an elaboration of what a Foundation Tax plan may be. I think this is the type of Foundation programme which we envisage. It is pointed out to you in the Metropolitan School Board brief and I believe this would be complete equalization of financial resources but we recognize that fact and we do not feel that that is essential to the adequate and efficient development of educational authorities in Metropolitan Toronto.

The Foundation plan will leave large areas free to innovate but it will remove the major inequalities of financial resources which are present now.

THE COMMISSIONER: You see I was struck by the fact that you refer to it as a Foundation Tax plan. What you mean is that there should be a Foundation educational programme which will provide a minimum educational standard throughout the area.

MR. STANBURY: Yes. That is correct.

THE COMMISSIONER: And how would it be financed? How would it help solve the problems where financial assistance, as you say, may be necessary?

MR. STANBURY: Well, I think the solution would start with the establishment of boroughs which







1 were financially relatively independent and the  
2 Foundation plan would be based on the same principles  
3 as the provincial grant system and the formula might  
4 depend upon conditions in different areas, even  
5 different areas within the same borough, because there  
6 are conditions varying from one school district to  
7 another even within the City of Toronto. I feel  
8 that this could be worked out quite adequately in the  
9 same way that the grant structure has been worked out,  
10 recognizing the needs and resources of each individual  
11 area.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Under the borough  
13 system which you advocated North York would pretty  
14 much continue as it is, perhaps with some changes;  
15 Scarborough too. Having regard to the size how  
16 would that help Scarborough which I am told suffers  
17 from an economic imbalance. The per pupil assess-  
18 ment in Scarborough is the lowest of any in the area.

19 How would the borough system and the  
20 Foundation plan which you are recommending change the  
21 position in Scarborough without other changes?

22 MR. STANBURY: The Foundation plan I  
23 don't think implies the same level of assistance  
24 would necessarily be available to all areas. It  
25 would depend on the resources and needs in the areas.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, if  
27 there were a continuation of the maintenance assis-  
28 tance payments they would no longer be uniform.  
29 Is that what you are saying?

30 MR. STANBURY: Yes, I think that is the





1       implication.

2                   THE COMMISSIONER: That is what I wanted  
3       to know. Thank you. Go ahead.

4                   MR. STANBURY: The second of the basic  
5       principles which we suggest is the principle of  
6       representation by population should apply, in broad  
7       terms, to the composition of the Metropolitan School  
8       Board. This can be effected by establishing a factor  
9       relating to population which would determine the number  
10      of trustees to serve on the Metropolitan School Board  
11      and the number to be elected to this Board by each  
12      local education authority.

13                  THE COMMISSIONER: Would you suggest that  
14      the Metropolitan School Board continue to consist of  
15      members of the local boards or the borough boards?

16                  MR. STANBURY: Yes, we do. Our third  
17      general principle is the jurisdiction of the local  
18      education authority and the municipal organization  
19      should coincide. It is noted that this does not  
20      preclude the establishment of one local education  
21      authority for more than one municipal organization,  
22      as in the case of the Lakeshore Board of Education  
23      now serving the municipalities of Mimico, New  
24      Toronto and Long Branch.

25                  We have stated an example of the estab-  
26      lishment of boroughs based on existing municipal  
27      organizations because we felt it our duty to do so;  
28      but we recognize the fact that existing municipal  
29      organizations may not continue and we recognize that  
30      it may be desirable that they not all continue as they







1 are, even North York.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: But you do make it  
3 clear there that North York has no territorial ambi-  
4 tions.

5 MR. STANBURY: We do. I think that when  
6 we consider that in about fifteen years North York  
7 will have as many students in its schools as Toronto  
8 has now it is clear that we need no more for quite a  
9 substantial school system. The organization of  
10 boroughs, which we do suggest as an example, would  
11 provide even the smallest education authorities with  
12 financial resources and school population equal to  
13 or greater than many cities in Ontario. At the  
14 same time, the larger boroughs would not become so  
15 vast and impersonal that the machinery of profes-  
16 sional administration would overshadow the essential  
17 interests and active participation of citizens as  
18 expressed in the activities of trustees elected to  
19 represent a relatively cohesive and comprehensible  
20 area.

21 In making these recommendations, we are  
22 not suggesting that the borough system will effect  
23 complete equalization of educational costs, but it is  
24 our considered judgment that the formation of boroughs,  
25 coupled with the foundation programme, can lessen  
26 significantly inequalities in the ability of local  
27 education authorities to meet the rapidly increasing  
28 costs of public education. At the same time we are  
29 convinced that the local educational systems will be  
30 strengthened and that the educational opportunities





1 of the individual student at his local school will  
2 be greatly enhanced.

3 The reorganization of the local education  
4 authorities would, of course, permit a re-definition  
5 of the constitution and responsibilities of the  
6 Metropolitan Board.





1 We are recommending, therefore,  
2 that each of the local education authorities (boroughs)  
3 would appoint one of its members for each 100,000 popu-  
4 lation or major fraction thereof to serve on the  
5 Metropolitan School Board. We believe it is logical  
6 to provide, further, that as boroughs may be added to  
7 the metropolitan area in the future, or as populations  
8 change, the composition of the Metropolitan School  
9 Board be adjusted according to the suggested formula.

10 The re-organized Metropolitan School Board  
11 would be so truly representative now and in the future,  
12 that it could and should be empowered to carry out  
13 certain responsibilities which can, perhaps, be more  
14 efficiently performed by one authority for the whole  
15 metropolitan community.

16 Accordingly, we recommend that capital fi-  
17 nancing should continue to be under the control of the  
18 Metropolitan School Board. The ceiling cost formula  
19 for new school construction should be maintained, sub-  
20 ject to annual review to ensure that the formula bears  
21 a direct relationship to current building costs and  
22 changing educational requirements. Ceiling cost formu-  
23 lae for the rehabilitation or modernization of schools  
24 should be established.

25 When it is necessary to incur expenditures  
26 for school construction beyond the ceiling cost, a  
27 local board should be required to secure the approval  
28 of the Metropolitan School Board for the use of current  
29 funds, even though these funds are obtained from the  
30 local municipality.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't think that would  
2 interfere with the autonomy that you want to maintain?

3 MR. STANBURY: I think it would leven the  
4 autonomy, if you like. It would provide somewhat the  
5 same restraints as the Senate of Canada, perhaps, pro-  
6 vides on the House of Commons. I do not think there  
7 would be interference to any serious degree, but there  
8 would be an opportunity for second thought on how it  
9 affects the relationships of the individual borough  
10 with the educational systems adjacent to it. It would  
11 recognize the fact that each borough system has an  
12 interest in the other, and the children of each system  
13 have an interest in the other because of the mobility  
14 which you mentioned.

15 Secondly, a foundation plan should be insti-  
16 tuted to provide flexibility for adjustments in the  
17 maintenance of assistance payments of the Metropolitan  
18 School Board, and so compensate for inequalities in the  
19 ability of local education authorities to meet edu-  
20 cational expenditures.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Assuming that a foundation  
22 programme were set up, would you allow each of the  
23 Boards to provide educational services beyond that pro-  
24 gramme at its own expense without having to go to the  
25 Metropolitan Board for approval?

26 MR. STANBURY: I believe so.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I would expect that.

28 MR. STANBURY: Third, the Metropolitan School  
29 Board should be empowered to establish a self-insurance  
30 fund for school property.





1 Fourth, the Metropolitan School Board as a  
2 central authority should be empowered to negotiate with  
3 the teachers' federations to establish salary schedules  
4 for academic staff within the Metropolitan area, the  
5 local board retaining the right of selection and as-  
6 signment of staff.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: You are prepared to waive  
8 autonomy in this matter too?

9 MR. STANBURY: We feel, Mr. Commissioner,  
10 that we have expressed to the Ontario Government and to  
11 the Metropolitan School Board, and I think the  
12 Metropolitan School Board has concurred in this -- we  
13 feel that teachers' salaries are such a large part of  
14 the financial burden of education that if this financ-  
15 ial burden is to be shared completely within the  
16 metropolitan area, that it is quite logical that the  
17 negotiation of the cost of those teaching services  
18 could be negotiated at a metropolitan level and establi-  
19 shed on a metro-wide basis.

20 We make reference in our brief to the fact  
21 the central authority which has been able to arrange  
22 financing of the tremendous programme of school con-  
23 struction within the Metropolitan area without in-  
24 fringing on the autonomy of the local Boards which  
25 have retained responsibility for design and construct-  
26 ion of schools can negotiate salary schedules applicable  
27 within the Metropolitan area without in any way in-  
28 fringing upon the autonomy of the local Boards which  
29 would retain responsibility for the selection and as-  
30 signment of staff.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Do I understand your  
2 position correctly then, Mr. Stanbury, that you are  
3 saying you want to retain as much autonomy as possible  
4 for the Local Boards, and in that connection there would  
5 necessarily be a variation in certain costs as between  
6 Boards?

7 MR. STANBURY: Yes.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: But that teachers' salaries  
9 constitute such a large element that uniformity is neces-  
10 sary in their case? Is that what you are saying?

11 MR. STANBURY: I think that sums it up. I  
12 think it could readily be obtained without any dis-  
13 advantage to any of the educational systems within  
14 Metropolitan Toronto, or to the teachers.

15 Fifth, the responsibilities of the Metropo-  
16 litan School Board for the determination, in consul-  
17 tation with the local boards, of school attendance  
18 areas involving more than one borough should be retained.

19 Facilities for special education should be  
20 financed by the Metropolitan School Board -- and, as  
21 at present, operated by a local education authority --  
22 only when such services are entirely experimental in  
23 nature or when the necessity for such educational pro-  
24 visions can be more efficiently performed by the central  
25 Board in behalf of the entire community.

26 We give as an example a special school for  
27 adult education and re-training in day and evening  
28 classes. Another example might be the proposed School  
29 for the Performing Arts which is suggested to serve the  
30 entire Metropolitan area.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I am interested in your  
2 suggestion that these special services should be fi-  
3 nanced by the Metropolitan School Board but operated by  
4 a local education authority. Why should they not also  
5 be administered or operated by the Metropolitan School  
6 Board?

7 MR. STANBURY: As the Metropolitan School  
8 Board is presently constituted, of course, it has no  
9 facilities for administering.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You would not want it to  
11 become an administrative Board?

12 MR. STANBURY: I see no need for that, Mr.  
13 Commissioner. I think the Boards which would be avail-  
14 able to operate such schools under the borough system  
15 would be quite competent to operate schools just as  
16 certain special education schools are operated now by  
17 local Boards for the Metropolitan area as a whole.  
18 The School for the Deaf, Sunnyview School for Crippled  
19 Children. We are quite content with the manner in  
20 which schools of this kind are operated now by a local  
21 authority, and we feel that this is quite a satisfactory  
22 arrangement. There would be no need for proliferation  
23 of administrative staff at the Metropolitan level for  
24 this purpose.

25 Seventh, the Metropolitan School Board should,  
26 in our judgment, be charged with a measure of responsi-  
27 bility for research in certain areas of educational  
28 administration. We recommend, therefore, that a re-  
29 search department in the Metropolitan School Board  
30 should be established to provide valid data for the





1 negotiation of teachers' salary schedules; carry out  
2 population studies to ensure a precise basis for new  
3 school construction in advance of need; assessing  
4 studies of new school design and construction; develop  
5 a building code for schools which would be acceptable  
6 throughout the metropolitan area; assist in essential  
7 experimentation in the use of data processing in edu-  
8 cational administration; participate, at request, or  
9 where considered necessary, in studies of the financial  
10 and business management operations of local Boards;  
11 and provide and maintain a research library available  
12 to the Metropolitan area.

13 In the preparation of this brief the Board  
14 kept constantly in mind the conviction that the ulti-  
15 mate purpose of any educational organization or admini-  
16 stration is to serve most efficiently and effectively  
17 the individual student in his classroom. We believe  
18 that implementation of the recommendations in this  
19 brief will make possible provision of all necessary  
20 educational arrangements according to the unique needs  
21 of individual students and will do this without the  
22 necessity of establishing a giant bureaucracy which  
23 would inevitably and unavoidably stifle educational  
24 progress.

25 We believe that implementation of the recom-  
26 mendations presented in this brief will foster the  
27 further development of education, in the tradition of  
28 our Province, as a public service closely related to  
29 the community, fully understood and actively supported  
30 by the people it serves.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr.  
2 Stanbury. I have asked the questions as I went along.

3 MR. STANBURY: Thank you, sir. You might be  
4 interested in additional information; to have a report  
5 which was prepared by the Board in 1959 on the first  
6 five years of its existence. As a matter of interest,  
7 North York's tax bill does show clearly to our citizens  
8 how much of the tax bill they are paying for education.  
9 I thought you might be interested to see our tax bill.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I thought that would be  
11 the case.

12 MR. STANBURY: They seem to be quite proud  
13 of the system they are paying for too I might add.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: I hope they are happy to  
15 pay it.

16 MR. STANBURY: I hope so too.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. The Board of  
18 Education of Swansea. Mr. Linton.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23 -  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION,  
VILLAGE OF SWANSEA

APPEARANCES:

MR. A. LINTON

MR. A. ADAMSON

DR. ALAN WILLIAMS

MR. NORMAN IVEY

-----

MR. LINTON: Mr. Commissioner, my name is Linton. I am Chairman of the School Board, and we appreciate the opportunity of presenting our case to you this morning. Our delegation comprises Mr. Alec Adamson who has been associated with education for many years in Toronto, and Dr. Alan Williams who will be speaking. These two gentlemen will be presenting our case. The other member of our delegation is Norman Ivey who is Secretary of our Board and Controller of the Village of Swansea. Mr. Adamson will speak first and then Dr. Williams.

THE COMMISSIONER: Your brief, Mr. Adamson, is included in the brief of the Village of Swansea?

MR. ADAMSON: Yes. It is the latter section of the brief, and I would just draw your attention to a couple of errors that have been overlooked in the proof-reading. On page 36, the Metro Toronto Board of Education should read Metropolitan School Board. Similarly, on page 37 it should read Metropolitan School Board rather than Metropolitan Board of Education.







1           The Swansea Board of Education is very  
2     pleased to present its views in the form of the brief  
3     which you have before you, and in adding thereto this  
4     oral presentation. Swansea is unique in being a pigmy  
5     in a group of municipal giants and in having juris-  
6     diction over only one elementary school. In such a  
7     small compact community there is a close relationship  
8     between the ratepayer and his elected representative  
9     that results in a better and more complete understand-  
10    ing of matters relating to education. This understand-  
11    ing creates harmony and prevents friction and discord.

12           The Metro School System as presently consti-  
13    tuted has enabled Swansea to produce as a right and  
14    not a privilege secondary education and services for  
15    children with physical and mental handicaps with re-  
16    sults beneficial to the child, the parent and the  
17    community.

18           There is no need to review the question of  
19    finance as you already have a wealth of detail from  
20    the Metro Board. We are one with other communities  
21    in the difficulty of teacher recruitment and teacher  
22    salaries. We have an added disadvantage in being un-  
23    able to offer as many opportunities for advancement as  
24    can be offered in the larger systems.

25           Nevertheless, the quality of education is  
26    not strained and is in step with progress and the needs  
27    of the times.

28           The brevity of our presentation is in inverse  
29    proportion to our belief in the effectiveness of the  
30    present Metro school system.





1           The Swansea Board of Education would be only  
2 too happy to clarify any points where you deem clarifi-  
3 cation is necessary. Dr. Williams will make a further  
4 presentation.

5           DR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Commissioner, we in Swansea  
6 are opposed to either partial or to total amalgamation  
7 in affairs of education.

8           Amalgamation of small school boards into  
9 larger boards is justified only if such act  
10 improves the quality and degree of education  
11 or allows substantial savings in the oper-  
12 ation of the school system without lowering  
13 educational standards.

14           We believe that neither educational nor  
15 economic advantage will be gained by the dis-  
16 appearance of the Swansea School Board either  
17 through partial or total amalgamation.

18           THE COMMISSIONER: Did I understand you to  
19 say that amalgamation, or I presume you included there  
20 consolidation into boroughs?

21           DR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

22           THE COMMISSIONER: That would only be justi-  
23 fied if it would save money?

24           DR. WILLIAMS: If it would either raise the  
25 standard of education or save money, yes.

26           Rather we believe the reverse to be  
27 true. That it will neither improve the quality  
28 and degree of education nor save money.

29           The child attending Swansea Public School  
30 has educational opportunities not offered to





1 the same degree in schools of neighbouring  
2 municipalities. These educational opportu-  
3 nities are offered in Art, Music, Industrial  
4 Arts & Crafts, Home Economics, and Remedial  
5 Reading. Each of these subjects is taught  
6 by a specialist teaching in an area specially  
7 equipped for the subject. Since the policy of  
8 the Metropolitan School Board does not sup-  
9 port these activities to the extent and de-  
10 gree that they are practised in Swansea  
11 School, we believe disappearance of the  
12 Swansea School Board would bring about a  
13 curtailment of education in the subjects  
14 mentioned.

15 In the economic sphere we can foresee  
16 no savings to be achieved that would not be  
17 at the expense of the child's education. The  
18 members of the school board receive no re-  
19 muneration and the loss of services of  
20 school board members with experience in  
21 teaching and management must needs be re-  
22 placed with hired help. The secretarial and  
23 clerical work of the board is carried out by  
24 the Village Clerk and his staff using the  
25 Municipal offices and equipment. The possi-  
26 bility of any economies lie in reducing teaching  
27 staff and this we are convinced will lower  
28 the high standards of teaching now existing  
29 at Swansea School.

30 Should amalgamation bring about the







1 disappearance of the Swansea School Board,  
2 opportunities for the citizens of Swansea  
3 to participate in the educational affairs  
4 of the community would be curtailed and the  
5 position of education would be weakened.

6 Members and former members of a board  
7 of education in a community form a group of  
8 people conversant with the needs and problems  
9 of education, ready to point out and correct  
10 faults in the educational system, ready to  
11 defend education against the acts of the ill  
12 advised and uninformed.

13 To sum up, we believe total or partial  
14 amalgamation would lower the educational  
15 standards now existing in Swansea School,  
16 would bring about no economies of operation,  
17 would thin the ranks of those familiar with  
18 the aims of the educational system. Swansea  
19 would be reduced from the status of a Village  
20 with a life and direction of its own to that  
21 of a Ward.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
23 gentlemen. We will adjourn until two o'clock.

24 --- NOON ADJOURNMENT  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 ---UPON RESUMING AT 2:00 P.M., MAY 5, 1964.

2  
3 SUBMISSION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE  
4 TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

5 APPEARANCES: MRS. M. A. CLARKE, Chairman

6 MR. W. NOBLEMAN, Chairman of Management

7 MR. ROBERT STONE, Vice-Chairman of the  
8 Board

9 MR. A. S. TAYLOR, Director of Education

10 MR. WILLIAM TAYLOR, Supervisor of Finance

11 MR. CLARK, Assistant Supervisor of Finance

12 THE COMMISSIONER: The Board of Education  
13 for the Township of Scarborough, Mrs. Clarke.

14 MRS. CLARKE: Mr. Goldenberg, it is a  
15 pleasure on behalf of the Board to present our brief  
16 to the Commission on the Corporation of Metropolitan  
17 Toronto. You have had our brief for some time. There  
18 are two propositions on which we base our whole  
19 presentation:

20 (1) Will a change in administration of  
21 education within Metropolitan Toronto promote a  
22 superior quality of education for all the students  
23 involved over that which currently exists?

24 (2) Will it result in an approximate  
25 equalization of educational costs at a level which can  
26 be supported by the community?

27 Our brief deals with items which bear  
28 on these factors. Our summary is on pages 21 and 22  
29 in the brief and consists of four items.

30 I would like to introduce the members  
of the Board who are with me. There is Mr. Nobleman,







1 our Chairman of Management; Mr. Robert Stone, Vice-  
2 Chairman of the Board; and our Director of Education,  
3 Mr. A. S. Taylor; Mr. William Taylor, Supervisor of  
4 Finance; Mr. Clark, Assistant Supervisor of Finance;  
5 and the two Trustees.

6 Mr. Nobleman and Mr. Stone and all of  
7 us are prepared to answer any question which you may  
8 care to direct to us.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: I have read your  
10 brief with interest more than once. I do have a  
11 few questions I would like to put to you. On page 2  
12 you have a table comparing pupil costs in secondary  
13 schools in Etobicoke, Scarborough, North York, and  
14 Toronto. Is there any significance to the fact that  
15 the salary figure is considerably lower in Scarborough  
16 than in North York and Etobicoke?

17 MR. STONE: Yes, sir, there is. There  
18 are two factors. In Scarborough the per pupil teacher  
19 ratio in secondary schools is 22. In Toronto, for  
20 example, it is 20. So this is one factor, the per  
21 pupil teacher ratio. Secondly, the higher per pupil  
22 cost in, say, Toronto is due in large part to the higher  
23 experience factor of Toronto teachers.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Does that apply to  
25 North York too?

26 MR. STONE: Perhaps not as much. The  
27 differential, however, is not as great between Scarborough  
28 and North York. At the present time the average  
29 experience factor of Toronto teachers has been  
30 calculated to be 10.53 years as compared to Scarborough's





1 5.52 years.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: That answers my  
3 question. There is another figure in that table:  
4 auxiliary services \$2.36 per pupil in Etobicoke,  
5 17¢ in Scarborough; \$8.57 in North York. What do  
6 you cover in auxiliary services?

7 MR. STONE: I am not prepared to answer  
8 in detail why these per pupil costs are different  
9 among the area Boards. However, I do believe that  
10 Mr. Clark, our Assistant Superintendent of Business  
11 and Finance, can answer that question.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: I am only picking  
13 the figures where there is a marked difference.

14 MR. CLARK: The figures are based on  
15 the Department of Education financial returns. The  
16 auxiliary services contain those items which, while  
17 not directly related to the teaching process,  
18 provide services intended to improve conditions under  
19 which the instruction is carried on. Perhaps an  
20 example would be the provision of milk to pupils in  
21 cafeterias; items of that sort that are not directly  
22 related.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: And the Scarborough  
24 expenditure on that is almost nil, on these auxiliary  
25 services. Why is that?

26 MR. CLARK: I believe it is due to the  
27 policy of the Board in trying to maintain a rather  
28 economic type of education which will give the education  
29 part of it and not spend too much on services which  
30 don't add to education.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I notice the table  
2 on page 3 showing the per pupil cost for public  
3 schools. There is again a marked difference between  
4 Scarborough on the one hand and Etobicoke, North York  
5 and Toronto on the other as to salaries.

6 MR. STONE: The same answer applies only  
7 more so.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Does it apply as  
9 between Scarborough and North York with the teacher  
10 experience?

11 MR. STONE: The per pupil teacher ratio.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Both secondary and  
13 elementary?

14 MR. STONE: The Metropolitan School Board,  
15 sir, recommends a per pupil teacher ratio of not  
16 greater than 35 pupils per classroom in elementary  
17 schools. Scarborough has tried to adhere to this as  
18 much as possible. This factor is mentioned on two  
19 or three occasions. Some Boards go as low as 28. This  
20 would make a substantial difference.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You keep a higher  
22 ratio?

23 MR. STONE: Yes. This is also related  
24 to the building programme because if we were to give  
25 a per pupil teacher ratio of 28 we would have provided  
26 more permanent classrooms, greater than we have at the  
27 present time. We have found, as will be shown in the  
28 supplementary data we are providing at this time, that  
29 if we were to build in accordance with the projections  
30 based, say, on 1958 for an individual school, we would







1 find we would be anywhere from 10 to 15% overbuilt in  
2 some school communities. Frequently these projections  
3 which are made are the best that can be obtained  
4 based on actual pupils in the area at the time. They  
5 simply are not borne out by experience.

6 Perhaps one of the factors involved in  
7 the variance between projections of pupils in a school  
8 is due to the somewhat higher rate of mobility within  
9 an urban area.

10 MR. NOBLEMAN: I wonder if I might add  
11 to that. We have a number of examples of communities  
12 which built up in the Township in the early days and  
13 which attracted large numbers of families with large  
14 numbers of young children. As these communities  
15 approached a more mature level in terms of ages and  
16 existence of the community, the number of pupils from  
17 each household declines. We have a number of  
18 instances. The public school in the extreme western  
19 edge of the Township had it maintained the enrollment  
20 pattern predicted in 1959 would today have 874 pupils.  
21 The actual enrollment in the building is 755. We can  
22 duplicate this as communities grow older.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 4 you  
24 criticize the City of Toronto. You say: "The City of  
25 Toronto has permitted a growth of administrative costs  
26 inconsistent with the chief objective of an educational  
27 system, which is to provide sound teaching."

28 Do you think that is a fair criticism?  
29 You don't take into account the wider range of services  
30 provided by Toronto, administrative costs of research





1 and so on.

2 MR. STONE: Yes, I think it is a fair  
3 criticism because a great deal of that administrative  
4 staff is non-teaching personnel.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: You have to have some  
6 non-teaching personnel in a school system.

7 MR. STONE: I would refer you to page  
8 44 of the statistical documents provided to you and  
9 drawn up by the Metropolitan School Board which  
10 indicates that the City of Toronto had at the end of  
11 1961 1,031 non-teaching staff members as compared to  
12 North York with 293 and Scarborough with 235 and  
13 Etobicoke with 143. And if you relate those to the  
14 numbers of pupils taught I simply find and consider  
15 that the figure for the City of Toronto is either  
16 untenably high or the others are untenably low.

17 It is our argument that our system is  
18 quite adequate and is providing a system of education  
19 well supported by research, well supported by auxiliary  
20 services, which we consider essential, and at a cost  
21 which can be borne by the public.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think you are  
23 taking into account a much wider range of services in  
24 Toronto as far as auxiliary services are concerned.  
25 I have pointed out to you that you spend next to  
26 nothing.

27 MR. STONE: May I add one point? In the  
28 event that the suburban Boards do not provide certain  
29 auxiliary services our pupils attend or are provided  
30 with the services by the City of Toronto, for which we







1 pay. These figures are all taken into account. We are  
2 providing the services and we pay for them and those  
3 figures are on there.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Maybe some of the  
5 excess administrative staff in Toronto is needed to  
6 service the children you don't service with these  
7 auxiliary services?

8 MR. NOBLEMAN: May I add that if you look  
9 at the context in which costs are drawn, the adminis-  
10 trative cost of non-teaching employees in non-teaching  
11 functions, research and these various other services  
12 which bear directly on education; if I understand  
13 the format they are charged a respective proportion  
14 of the education costs. Non-teaching administrative  
15 employees are head office administrative personnel,  
16 plant supervision, purchasing and so on. They do not  
17 appear on the head office administrative staff for  
18 education. These are non-teaching employees throughout.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 18 you  
20 say: "It is imperative that those concerned with the  
21 future of this municipality press for the absorption  
22 of all existing school debenture debt and new  
23 debenture up to the Metropolitan ceiling in the  
24 Metropolitan Corporation."

25 I understand that the Metropolitan  
26 Corporation is assuming the debenture debt as from  
27 January 1st of this year but you wanted to assume the  
28 debt incurred between 1954 and 1964. Can you tell me by  
29 how much that would benefit Scarborough annually?  
30





1 MR. NOBLEMAN: Sir, if all Scarborough  
2 debt charges had been assumed by Metropolitan School  
3 Board as of January 1st, 1964 the residential mill  
4 rate in Scarborough would have been reduced in  
5 elementary schools by 2.21 mills; in secondary  
6 schools by 2.41 mills, a total deduction of 4.53 mills.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 21 you say  
8 that the Board of Education for the Township of  
9 Scarborough is on record as supporting a foundation  
10 plan and borough organization. How would the  
11 foundation plan help Scarborough which now has the  
12 lowest assessment per pupil and about which I hear  
13 a great deal in relation to financial imbalance? I  
14 leave it to your Chairman to pick a person who is to  
15 reply.

16 MR. STONE: I think the major problem,  
17 if you will bear with me, is related to the existing  
18 scheme whereby an attempt is made to equalize the  
19 burden of the cost of education across the community  
20 through the function of the maintenance assistance  
21 payment.

22 Now, as I understand it, when Mr. Cumming  
23 brought down his report in 1953 it was recommended and  
24 intended that maintenance assistance payments would  
25 bear a relationship of 60% to the average per pupil  
26 cost in both secondary and elementary schools across  
27 the area.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think Mr.  
29 Cumming spelled that out.

30 MR. STONE: Unfortunately. Perhaps this







1 was the mistake. This was the broad understanding  
2 which was not incorporated into Bill 80. In that  
3 first year of the Metropolitan Corporation's existence  
4 the Province established the rate and I suppose it  
5 was rather hopefully assumed this relationship would  
6 be maintained in subsequent years. Well, it was not,  
7 as has been borne out by the brief you received from  
8 the Metropolitan School Board itself.

9           When this brief of ours was written  
10 we had no idea, of course, of the short run of events  
11 which so often happen in public affairs. I think  
12 that it was a surprise to a great many this last year,  
13 this year 1964, is the first year since 1955 which  
14 the Metropolitan School Board has established a  
15 relationship of 60% maintenance assistance payment  
16 across the entire region.

17           Perhaps it points up something else that  
18 to leave such a relationship of equalization to the  
19 good offices of members of various communities to try  
20 and arrive at something which is fair and equitable  
21 is asking sometimes too much because the local board  
22 members loyalties which it is true are to the entire  
23 region, are also to his own Board and he quite frequently  
24 may find under the existing organization and the  
25 existing attempt of equalization that these two things  
26 are definitely at conflict and a premise may be reached,  
27 it has happened every year but 1955 and 1964, that  
28 equalization is not in fact attained.

29           It is our Board's opinion that if the  
30 existing structure is to be improved in order to obtain







1 equalization of educational costs across Metropolitan  
2 Toronto, then it becomes essential to establish such  
3 a relationship in law rather than the whims and fancies  
4 of a particular Board from year to year.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: What would the law  
6 provide?

7 MR. STONE: We have suggested that a  
8 formula be provided which would relate the per pupil  
9 teacher ratio to the average daily attendance. Now  
10 this is not my invention. It is Mr. Nobleman's  
11 invention and one I concur in wholeheartedly. I  
12 would prefer he speak to it.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: That is not in your  
14 brief.

15 MR. NOBLEMAN: Actually the working  
16 out of a specific formula is a question on which I  
17 speak entirely for myself. The intent of the formula  
18 is clear. We would propose that the two basic items  
19 which a revised Metropolitan School Board should deal  
20 with should be teacher salaries and capital cost. We  
21 feel their contribution to the area Board should be  
22 based upon payment of these two items alone. These  
23 two items would account for, if a formula similar to  
24 the one we propose is to be carried through, to a  
25 very substantial account, in most cases in excess of  
26 the 60% of the total account.

27 With regard to teacher's salaries in  
28 the elementary schools we would propose the average  
29 teacher's salary in a given municipality be calculated  
30 and that that municipality be paid as a portion of





1 maintenance assistance payment the average teacher's  
2 salary times the average total attendance divided  
3 by -- for public school purposes we suggest 28, this  
4 being the relationship between pupils and teachers in  
5 the given class.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: And in municipalities  
7 where the ratio is lower they would get less?

8 MR. NOBLEMAN: Precisely. The point  
9 was made in a document by Metropolitan Toronto as  
10 to those Boards whose pupils-teachers ratios were  
11 abnormally low. That statement was directed at  
12 areas as low as 20-21. I presume that meant Scarborough.  
13 We were the only people on the other end of the scale  
14 whose ratio was above the average. It was exactly 28.

15 They felt this should not obtain and the  
16 municipality should be prepared to provide what the  
17 Committee of the Metropolitan School Board obviously  
18 felt was unrealistically low. The per pupil teacher ratio  
19 in schools should be a direct charge on the local  
20 municipality. We would ask the Province for legislation  
21 on what is a reasonably fair per pupil teacher ratio  
22 and payment of teachers' salaries from Metro be geared to  
23 that ratio.

24 It should be borne in mind this is based on  
25 uniform teachers' scale throughout the area. This is  
26 presuming that there is a uniform salary scale and  
27 the basis of the wages paid to the individual teachers  
28 in an individual municipality are uniform.

29 We have calculations of these figures  
30 which we would be delighted to provide to you as a







1 supplement to our brief.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: That would be part  
3 of your foundation plan?

4 MR. NOBLEMAN: Our foundation plan is  
5 simply we suggest a quite adequate plan would be the  
6 assumption of payments for teachers and debt charges.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: By?

8 MR. NOBLEMAN: The metropolitan area.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: The metropolitan area  
10 should pay all teachers' salaries, that is, within  
11 the scale, is that it?

12 MR. NOBLEMAN: And all debt charges.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You are prepared  
14 to finance the rest?

15 MR. STONE: Yes. I might suggest there  
16 happens to be an exceedingly close relationship between  
17 these two items and figures like 60% of total cost.  
18 The teachers' salaries plus the debt charges in 1962  
19 in the elementary schools of Etobicoke accounted for  
20 almost 70% of the total cost; in Scarborough almost  
21 exactly 68%; in North York 66%; in the City of Toronto  
22 59%. Similarly in secondary schools these two items  
23 in Etobicoke accounted for just under 74%; in Scar-  
24 borough just under 62%; in North York 57%; and in  
25 the City of Toronto just under 54%.

26 We might add also that inasmuch as we  
27 feel that the provision of adequate buildings for  
28 the purpose of education and the provision of a good  
29 staff are a primary responsibility of the Board, this  
30 puts the responsibility for the main items for the area





1 as a whole. If people wish to jockey on strange items  
2 in many areas we feel it should be properly a charge  
3 of the local area.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Your use of the  
5 term "foundation plan" is not really what we normally  
6 call a foundation plan. A foundation plan is a minimum  
7 programme. It can be done in different ways, as the  
8 report of the Metropolitan Boards Committee pointed  
9 out. Your foundation plan is very simple: The  
10 Metropolitan Board will negotiate the teachers' salaries  
11 and pay those salaries and it will pay the capital  
12 costs and you will look after all the rest.

13 MR. NOBLEMAN: That is it. The  
14 essential difference arises in what one defines as a  
15 foundation. We think good teaching is a foundation.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't think there  
17 might be better teaching in some municipality if the  
18 municipality were allowed to negotiate its own  
19 teachers' salaries?

20 MR. NOBLEMAN: To answer a direct  
21 question, sir, I will say it is a fact of economic life  
22 which has been very obvious in the area that there is  
23 a certain attraction to better pay in terms of  
24 attracting the low qualified teachers. The suggestion  
25 that there should be a uniform salary scale is  
26 the basic thread which underlies the entire plan. It is  
27 our considered opinion as a Board that competition  
28 between Boards for teachers should be based not upon  
29 a differential in the salary scale, presuming always  
30 the salary scale is sufficient to attract good people to





1 the profession and keep them there, but competition  
2 should be based on the atmosphere in which the teacher  
3 will work, the specific working conditions under which  
4 they may work and the educational philosophy with  
5 which the system runs. These are the bases on which  
6 people should be attracted to specific systems.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you feel Scarborough  
8 would solve its financial problems if 60%, which seems  
9 to be the figure you adhere to, if 60% of the school  
10 costs were borne by the area as a whole?

11 MR. STONE: Yes, we do, sir. Part of our  
12 problem in the last three years, which became apparent  
13 with dramatic impact this year when we costed out our  
14 budget prior to the establishment of the assistance  
15 payments for 1964, was due to the exceedingly rapid  
16 increase in secondary school pupils.

17 The average rate of increase for the  
18 last few years has been 20% per annum, which is rather  
19 substantial growth rate. Our projections indicate the  
20 growth rate will tend to decline in the last five years.  
21 In fact in the year five from 1964 this growth rate  
22 will have tapered off to about 7% per annum.

23 In addition, part of our problem was  
24 our natural anxiety to provide as broad educational  
25 service as anybody else and this competitive factor  
26 within Metro, which has been pointed out in the Metro  
27 brief, was also at work in Scarborough when we  
28 established technical and commercial education some  
29 years ago and more recently, two years ago, it was  
30 apparent that in those two particular class functions







1 the per pupil teacher ratio was exceedingly low in  
2 Scarborough as compared to other areas.

3 In addition we are of the opinion that  
4 the ratio of residential and commercial and industrial  
5 assessment in the Township is gradually improving.  
6 Nine years ago this relationship in Scarborough was  
7 in the order of  $23\frac{1}{2}\%$ . I believe now it is 32%. One  
8 would hope that with a tighter rein on planning in  
9 the Township this relationship might continue to  
10 improve to a more, shall we say, viable relationship,  
11 perhaps even 40 - 60 by early 1970's so the burden  
12 would tend to decline as time went on.

13 It seems to me and to many of us that  
14 that seems to be a reasonable projection of the  
15 situation and we do not feel it is necessary to bang  
16 into another form or support another form of government  
17 because of difficulties which are more the result of  
18 the inadequacies of Bill 80 than anything else.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: What proportion of  
20 your costs in 1964 would be paid by the Metro levy? Do  
21 you say close to 60%?

22 MR. STONE: It will be substantially  
23 over that in elementary schools, the cost of the increase  
24 in the maintenance assistance payment. It will be  
25 closer to it or slightly under in the case of secondary.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Then your problems  
27 are solved?

28 MR. NOBLEMAN: We presume to a considerable  
29 degree this is so. Our presence reflects the belief  
30 of others they are not.





1 MR. STONE: They are not solved  
2 because --

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You better get the  
4 Board together.

5 MR. STONE: I must make a firm point  
6 again. Under the existing structure maintenance  
7 assistance payments will have to be renegotiated again  
8 in 1965 and who knows, it may be even reduced. Teachers'  
9 salaries are going to increase, that is the safest  
10 projection of all because they have, as you know, a  
11 scale on which teachers are paid and there is a built-in  
12 incremental factor of \$300 per annum anyway and as your  
13 ratio of experienced staff increases then the burden  
14 becomes that much greater.

15 Certainly I don't think we would like to  
16 give the impression that Scarborough is of the opinion  
17 that it can survive as an island unto its own.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30







1           We have always supported the metropolitan  
2 concept, and we do so today. We want a stronger metro-  
3 politan function but not necessarily one which destroys  
4 initiative of the area board in the field of experi-  
5 mentation, the field of broadening services, and one  
6 which would perhaps lead to excessive centralization of  
7 administration.

8           THE COMMISSIONER: Have you anything to add,  
9 Mrs. Clark?

10          MRS. CLARK: I think perhaps Mr. Nobleman has  
11 a summation.

12          MR. NOBLEMAN: I think in speaking to this,  
13 and possibly the rather flip answer I might have given  
14 to your question, we have not spoken to what I think  
15 is the essential item either in the concern which some  
16 people feel about the purported state of education in  
17 the area generally and the Township of Scarborough in  
18 particular, nor as we ourselves feel is the reason for  
19 taking the particular stand we do.

20          There has been a flat statement made on  
21 numerous occasions that one may take as an accurate  
22 index of educational equality and quality the amount of  
23 money spent on education in a given municipality. We  
24 submit the figures we have provided to you indicate to  
25 a considerable degree this is an extremely arbitrary  
26 and extremely misleading statement of a situation.  
27 In fact, it is possible for a Board of Education to  
28 spend a great deal of money on many things which are  
29 controlled by factors other than the quality of class-  
30 room instruction received by the child. We would





1 suggest, for example, very heavy maintenance costs  
2 faced by the City of Toronto which are reflected in  
3 these costs, and are an indication simply of the age  
4 of the school plant. They have nothing to do with the  
5 quality of instruction that goes on inside in the most  
6 general terms.

7 We have examined, as Mrs. Clark pointed out  
8 in the original instance, the question of whether or  
9 not the changes proposed in various briefs including  
10 those of the Metropolitan School Board and including  
11 the prior case made for what is termed equalization of  
12 educational opportunity with some care. We are unable  
13 to ascertain what, in our judgment, would result from  
14 any of these changes in the way of improved education  
15 for the children in our classrooms. In fact, if I  
16 might make a personal statement, the only real ad-  
17 vantage which I can see would be a drastic reduction  
18 in the pupil-teacher ratio which the Metropolitan  
19 School Board has flatly stated would not be the result  
20 of an amalgamated system in their judgment.

21 Therefore, I suggest that as far as quality  
22 of education given to the children in the individual  
23 municipalities, we submit it differs very little. It  
24 is uniformly high throughout the area, and we submit  
25 in Scarborough it is as high as any, and certainly as  
26 good as any.

27 We have examined carefully the basis upon  
28 which we plan our school building programme. As you  
29 are no doubt aware, we do not have, for example,  
30 intermediate schools. This resulted from a very careful





1 and very thorough investigation by our officials of  
2 the various merits of various forms of organization.  
3 We have come to the conclusion that there is little to  
4 choose between the forms of organization. The basic  
5 kindergarten to Grade VIII and Grades IX to XIII organi-  
6 zation as such offers as good educational opportunities  
7 as any other system we can see. This being the case,  
8 we see no virtue in change for the sake of change or  
9 change for the sake of merely spending more money which  
10 seems to be a central thought in the minds of some  
11 people in this area.

12 I would like to comment also not only on the  
13 existing programme based on careful assessment of what  
14 is best for the pupils, but also the statement con-  
15 tained in the Metropolitan brief that trail-blazing is  
16 the exclusive right of the areas with favourable as-  
17 sessment does not stand up to more careful examination.

18 As you yourself pointed out, sir, we have  
19 beyond question the most unfavourable financial base  
20 from which to trail-blaze, and I would submit the  
21 metropolitan brief in itself gives clear-cut evidence  
22 of the degree to which we have been prepared to move  
23 ahead and our ability to do so.

24 It is no accident, for example, that we are  
25 one of the only two areas who have set up special  
26 programmes for those pupils wanting to proceed to  
27 secondary schools, but not wanting to proceed to the  
28 regular secondary schools. Scarborough and Toronto are  
29 the only areas with specific schools for these pupils.

30 Similarly, we have done, as this massive







1 document indicates, very careful examination of the  
2 curriculae to which our children are exposed. We have  
3 worked on this carefully. We can trail-blaze. We do.

4 This is even more true in secondary schools.  
5 An event which occurred I believe in the same committee  
6 room very recently resulted in a commitment from the  
7 Minister of Labour to the Board of Education for the  
8 Township of Scarborough that an experimental approach  
9 to the combination of apprenticeship with technical  
10 training in the secondary schools would take place in  
11 Scarborough, and this resulted from a clear-cut sug-  
12 gestion from the Board of Education for the Township  
13 of Scarborough.

14 We feel that the statement that educational  
15 equality can be measured by the amount of money spent  
16 is patent nonsense for the most part. The fact we and  
17 other boards in this area choose to spend our money on  
18 what we consider to be foundations of education is the  
19 main basis for the lower cost. This, of course, is  
20 combined with the fact that I have yet to hear, except  
21 in this instance, of a situation in which the discipline  
22 imposed by restricted finances is considered to be  
23 a negative in the way in which a governmental body ap-  
24 proaches spending.

25 We think many of the suggested changes con-  
26 tained in other briefs really would add little to the  
27 children. For this reason, therefore, we see no  
28 reason for change beyond those specific changes which  
29 we have suggested which would be necessary to (a) bring  
30 some basis, some uniform basis to payment of the actual





1 essentials; teachers' salaries and provision of build-  
2 ings, and to equate representation more equitably on  
3 the central body.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: If you recommend that  
5 teachers' salaries be paid by the Metropolitan Board,  
6 that capital costs be paid by the Metropolitan Board,  
7 and then you add that there is uniform -- I don't  
8 remember the language you used -- but that the edu-  
9 cation offered in the different municipalities is un-  
10 iformly high, why retain the individual boards? Why  
11 not have one board to administer education throughout  
12 the area, and you would not be faced with your parti-  
13 cular financial problem?

14 MR. NOBLEMAN: This, sir, is like religion.  
15 There are many ways to have it. The statement is  
16 frequently made -- it is made, as a matter of fact, ad  
17 nauseum by the local newspapers -- that this area is  
18 one economic, social and cultural unit. One economic  
19 unit it may be to some considerable degree, but I think  
20 any close examination of the patterns of life would  
21 instantly reveal it is very definitely not in many  
22 points one social or cultural unit.

23 In fact I would suggest to you, sir, the  
24 fact that at least one of the major metropolitan news-  
25 papers feels it is necessary to provide special editions  
26 for these areas which are so much alike, is an indi-  
27 cation of how much they themselves recognize this state-  
28 ment is not so. The dead hand of uniformity in edu-  
29 cation could be best recognized in the tribulations  
30 which are being undergone by such countries as France







1 where education is completely centralized, completely  
2 controlled curriculae are detailed in the most meti-  
3 culous fashion from the administrative capital of the  
4 nation. Teaching methods, promotions, handling of  
5 staff, handling of the individual pupil are all ex-  
6 tremely rigid. This in terms of what is suggested as  
7 an ideal is the result in France, and France I think  
8 would agree it is having one of the most difficult  
9 situations in terms of adjusting its education to the  
10 20th Century of any nation in the world.

11 The fact that we can have uniformly as high a  
12 quality does not necessarily mean this arises from a  
13 uniform approach, uniform procedures or uniform standards.  
14 There are points of measurable difference in the way in  
15 which we provide a uniform quality of education to those  
16 of other municipalities. I would say one obvious ex-  
17 ample is the area of secondary schools where we have  
18 decided as a matter of careful examination that all of  
19 the three major branches of secondary education --  
20 academic, commerce and technical -- must in our munici-  
21 pality to be most effective be provided in the same  
22 school. The City of Toronto feels with equal con-  
23 viction to answer its particular needs they should be  
24 provided in separate schools.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a matter of con-  
26 viction or finances?

27 MR. NOBLEMAN: It is a matter of conviction.  
28 We prepared and we have as an exhibit two documents re-  
29 flecting the careful thought we gave to this decision  
30 before we undertook this particular pattern of building.





1 We have no desire to impose what we consider to be a  
2 solution for our circumstances on Toronto; we have  
3 equally little desire to see their decision imposed on  
4 us.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: You have answered my  
6 questions, Mr. Nobleman. Thank you very much.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 -  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 -  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 -  
27  
28  
29  
30





THE SUBMISSION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF YORK

APPEARANCES:

MR. J. YOUNG	- Chairman
MR. FRANK OKE	- Chairman of Finance
MRS. EVELYN HOWE	- Chairman of Staff Relations
MRS. MARGARET ABBS	- Vice-Chairman of Advisory Vocational Committee
MR. J. HOGARTH	- Trustee
MR. HARRY ROYLE	- Trustee
MR. GORDON JAMES	- Business Administration
MR. ROY RUTHERFORD	- Superintendent of Secondary Schools
MR. D. HAMNER	- Superintendent of Public Schools
MR. ROLAND MAY, Q.C.	- Solicitor for Board

-----

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Commissioner, may I introduce the members of our Board who are present? Trustee Frank Oke, Chairman of Finance, Trustee Mrs. Abbs, Trustee Mrs. Howe, Chairman of Staff Relations, Mr. Roy Rutherford, Superintendent of Secondary School Education, Mr. Hamner, Superintendent of Public School Education, Mr. Roland May, Solicitor for the Board, Mr. James, our Business Administrator, Mr. Hogarth, Trustee, and Mr. Harry Royle, Trustee.

Mr. Commissioner, we note that on the list of representations to you that the York Board of Education is 26.







1 THE COMMISSIONER: These, of course, are  
2 not in order of importance.

3 MR. YOUNG: No. I would assume that you  
4 have your own reasons.

5 It is not our intention Mr. Commissioner  
6 to belabour repetitious points, but rather to  
7 present to you a few comments respecting the  
8 general point of view of the York Board of  
9 Education towards the metropolitan organi-  
10 zation, followed by a more direct reference  
11 to our brief proper as submitted to you.

12 I would first like to direct your at-  
13 tention to the appendix of the brief proper,  
14 with particular reference to proposals made  
15 by the Board before the Metropolitan School  
16 Board, on one of the many occasions the  
17 matter of amalgamation has been under dis-  
18 cussion.

19 Two years ago, in 1962, our Board  
20 withstood the pressures for a radical change  
21 in the metropolitan organization, and in-  
22 sisted upon a thorough study of all alter-  
23 nate proposals before any change in existing  
24 legislation was advanced. The tenor of our  
25 position has always been, as we state on ap-  
26 pendix page 17, "that hurried consideration  
27 must not be permitted and the outcome of any  
28 plan must be very specifically known before  
29 we throw away the known for the unknown."

30 The text of the Board's comments in





1 1962 was filed with the Minister of Education  
2 and the Prime Minister of Ontario. It was  
3 widely circulated to each Board in the  
4 Metropolitan area, as well as to the  
5 Municipalities proper, and it is with a  
6 certain satisfaction that we note that the  
7 proposals as contained in our circulated  
8 comments are the basis of a majority of the  
9 proposals respecting a borough organization  
10 that have been presented to you. Our basic  
11 views expressed at that time have not altered,  
12 but rather they have been strengthened,  
13 particularly insofar as the necessity for a  
14 variety of opinion being absolutely necessary  
15 for effective representation and the function-  
16 ing of any Metropolitan Government.

17 Autocratic government hewing to a  
18 line of policy, simply because there is no  
19 room for a human approach to local problems,  
20 should be avoided at all costs. Largeness by  
21 its very nature, produces a monolithic single  
22 approach, completely bureaucratic in outlook,  
23 which once established seems almost impossible  
24 to abolish. Centralized authority looks  
25 efficient on a chart, but centralization in  
26 terms of carrying out democratic procedures and  
27 in having a healthy participation of the people  
28 whom we as elected persons represent, we  
29 believe, has an opposite effect.

30 The metropolitan organization cannot







1 be allowed to stagnate. If re-shaping of the  
2 plan is necessary then let us do so with  
3 despatch. The basis of the Board's brief  
4 is that any re-shaping can be done within  
5 the general concepts we have been working  
6 with for ten years under the Metropolitan School  
7 Board jurisdiction. We believe Mr. Commissioner,  
8 that the Metropolitan School Board is a  
9 success and that if the Metropolitan School  
10 Board had extended powers, many of the  
11 weaknesses laid at the door of the existing  
12 form of government could be removed. If  
13 these can only be removed by a certain loss  
14 of autonomy of local boards, then this price  
15 must be paid. The Board's own proposals  
16 as contained in the brief recognize this,  
17 and the members of our Board do not seek in  
18 any way to perpetuate themselves in office.  
19 But, in the final analysis the most satis-  
20 factory solution must be one wherein the  
21 most benefit for the entire Metropolitan  
22 Area has to be achieved.

23 A variety of vigorous opinions is  
24 necessary for healthy government. There is at  
25 the local level an independence of views  
26 which when brought to a centralized body  
27 such as the Metropolitan School Board,  
28 constitute an important aspect which is  
29 likely to be totally lacking in a single  
30 fountainhead, remote from local problems.





1                   In their relationships at a local  
2 level, Trustees have a bond with their com-  
3 munities. They are daily confronted with  
4 local problems to which they give their  
5 personal attention. We are called upon  
6 constantly for assistance because there is  
7 direct contact with the people and a mutual  
8 confidence which stems simply from being there  
9 and being available. It is something ex-  
10 tremely valuable which is in great danger of  
11 being lost through excessive centralization.  
12 It is a significant part of living in a  
13 community and it would be tragic if the  
14 protagonists for amalgamation succeed in  
15 destroying this aspect of our community life.  
16 Regardless of any shuffle necessary to improve  
17 our Metropolitan Government any loss of  
18 direct contact with the people cannot be  
19 countenanced.

20                   Turning to the brief proper, sir, the  
21 first three chapters briefly establish an  
22 historical context in respect of York and  
23 describe the existing elementary and secondary  
24 school systems. Suffice it to note that  
25 York is the 8th largest municipality in the  
26 Province of Ontario and that as such it has  
27 a long history of effective school operation,  
28 promoting sound educational policies. York  
29 is rooted at the very origins of municipal  
30 government in the Metropolitan Area and 171





1 years of responsible local government is not  
2 something our Board wishes to see relinquished  
3 without due consideration.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 -  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 -  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 -  
28  
29  
30







1                   On pages 22 and 23 there is a short summary  
2 of York's position in the Metropolitan community  
3 apropos the educational system. It is pointed  
4 out that York has been both a giver to the  
5 Metropolitan community as well as a gainer in  
6 proportion to its assessment to the total Metropolitan  
7 assessment, and this has been within the very spirit  
8 of Bill 80. We give for the support of the Metro-  
9 politan community in the areas of debenture financing,  
10 legislative grants and metropolitan levy and we gain  
11 chiefly as a result of special educational services  
12 promoted by the Metropolitan School Board itself.

13                   In 1953 we were established as a Metro-  
14 politan community as surely and definitely as any  
15 corporate body, to facilitate the aims of Mr.  
16 Cumming's report, which envisaged a reasonable amount  
17 of financial give and take between the participating  
18 school boards. The philosophy of the report was  
19 "that the combined resources of the entire area are  
20 to be made available to support education". Let  
21 us remember that non-residential assessment provides  
22 the funds for a very extensive portion of educational  
23 costs, and by and large it is not the individual commun-  
24 ities that support the businesses which provide this  
25 assessment. Head offices of companies may be  
26 located in our midst because of convenience,  
27 but they themselves draw their profits from a much  
28 wider area, and indeed, in the case of the largest  
29 corporations, from across Canada and the world.  
30 Bill 80 provided quite correctly for the distribution





1 of this assessment if for no other reason than to  
2 recognize the relationship of so-called dormitory  
3 municipalities to the industrial area. It was with  
4 keen insight that the writers of Bill 80 saw that with-  
5 out the suburban belts to house the growing popula-  
6 tion and to provide space to accommodate the industrial  
7 development, the life blood of commerce in the area  
8 would beat more slowly.

9 The concentration of non-residential  
10 assessment has changed in the past ten years, perhaps  
11 slowly, but surely, and as this change continues to be  
12 a part of our modern scene, the positions of financial  
13 interchange within the Metropolitan local governments  
14 will also change. It is entirely reasonable to  
15 conceive that the commercial assessment of the  
16 existing City of Toronto and of the suburban munici-  
17 palities will be ultimately balanced, and perhaps  
18 even be reversed. As this occurs, our respective  
19 financial responsibilities to the Metropolitan com-  
20 munity must be proportionately borne, just as they  
21 are fairly borne at the present time.

22 The text of the brief to page 23 provides  
23 additional pertinent detail respecting York's position  
24 in the Metropolitan community which we hope will be  
25 further indicative of our appraisal in this regard.

26 On page 24 we indicate that the success of  
27 the Metropolitan School Board respecting special  
28 education has the full support of our Board.  
29 Attention to the special education services has  
30 been a policy of the York Board for over 25 years.







1 giant strides have been taken, and the consolidation  
2 of special services education in the Metropolitan  
3 area and their extension, is one example of the  
4 success of the Metropolitan School Board. It is  
5 the kind of education which can best be coordinated  
6 by that Board because, in most systems, the number of  
7 pupils requiring special instruction of this  
8 nature is not so great as to generally encourage the  
9 establishment of classes for them, concurrent with  
10 the high cost of their operation. It is in the  
11 successful resolution of problems of this nature  
12 that the strength of the Metropolitan School Board is  
13 amply demonstrated.

14 The Board of Education for the Township  
15 of York supports the application presently before the  
16 Minister of Education for the provision of enabling  
17 legislation to establish a uniform teachers' salary  
18 schedule for the Metropolitan area. York has con-  
19 sistently supported the view that a Metropolitan  
20 Salary Schedule could be of benefit to the whole  
21 area. Such a salary schedule, Mr. Commissioner,  
22 could recognize many of the problems facing Boards  
23 respecting placement of teachers and, if necessary,  
24 provide special allowances for teaching in less  
25 centrally located schools, but it would enable the  
26 best teachers to be placed where they are needed.  
27 The competitive factor would be eliminated from the  
28 point of view of one Board vying against another for  
29 teacher recruitment. At the same time due recog-  
30 nition could be given to the teachers' legitimate





1 claims for adequate salary standards.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you suggesting  
3 there that there would be no more competition for  
4 teachers?

5 MR. YOUNG: There would be no more com-  
6 petition for teachers on a dollars and cents basis  
7 within the Metropolitan area if a uniform salary  
8 schedule was established based on equal qualifications  
9 in every area. This will take a little time because  
10 of the necessary defection on the part of some of the  
11 municipalities; but over a short period of years this  
12 would be levelled off. There is no question but  
13 we would be competing within the province and other  
14 areas but not within the Metropolitan area.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I do not see how you  
16 would eliminate competition within the area. There  
17 are differences between the different municipalities.  
18 Teachers might prefer to go to one rather than to  
19 another.

20 MR. YOUNG: On that basis I think all the  
21 municipalities have an equal attraction. Some people  
22 like to work within the heart of a metropolitan area.  
23 Some people like to work within the suburbs. There  
24 would be a balance. This balance was achieved prior  
25 to this.

26 During the last number of years the basic  
27 requirements in a school, such as accommodation and  
28 facilities have been equalized to a large extent and  
29 on that basis alone there is little from a fiscal point  
30 of view to draw a teacher from one area to another.





1 There are the local relations with the Board, with the  
2 administrative academic staff. These things are  
3 within the jurisdiction of the local boards of control  
4 and their normal teacher relations with the Board.  
5 These things are the things that are the responsibility  
6 of the Board and I think that every board has reached  
7 a level where they can look after their own teachers.

8 But I think at the moment the dollars and  
9 cents gimmick which has been raised as an objection  
10 by various boards is the governing factor -- and I would  
11 like to elaborate a little later specifically in that  
12 area.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: It is an important  
14 gimmick in our civilization -- the dollars and cents  
15 factor.

16 MR. YOUNG: In business it can be a  
17 gimmick. In the field of education within the  
18 Metropolitan area such as we have here at the tax-  
19 payers' expense it is not a gimmick that should be  
20 used. It is in fact in many aspects an insult to  
21 professional integrity -- some of the gimmicks that  
22 have been used.

23 I would like to point out, Mr. Commissioner,  
24 since you have raised this point, Etobicoke and their  
25 "master race" -- I should have said their master  
26 teacher level. This is a level that is used by  
27 Etobicoke alone in the Metropolitan area to keep  
28 teachers on their staff and also to attract teachers  
29 away from other staffs. This is an attraction not  
30 resorted to in any level of provincial, federal or







1 municipal employment, nor is it resorted to in  
2 industry.

3 Surely in the teacher level, the profes-  
4 sional level, we should expect teachers who have a  
5 normal increment -- they have levels by which through  
6 professional attainment of higher qualifications  
7 they can rise in dollars and cents -- surely they  
8 do not need to have this kind of bonus in order to  
9 make them do what every other person who is employed  
10 has to do, and that is to give his best. You expect  
11 of the profession of teachers that in the normal  
12 operation of their profession they will give their  
13 best for the amount of money that they are paid. This  
14 kind of gimmick is really a gimmick and nothing else.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Surely you do not  
16 mean it when you say this gimmick is confined to  
17 Etobicoke in its relations to teachers?

18 MR. YOUNG: This particular gimmick of  
19 a master teacher category.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, yes, that particular  
21 one.

22 MR. YOUNG: I would say, sir, there are  
23 one or two other boards who have equally been derelict  
24 in areas such as that, but not to the extent of  
25 Etobicoke, who had sat in on our salary negotiation  
26 committees and more or less ascertained what other  
27 boards are going to offer and have deliberately  
28 every year -- bar the last year when I think they  
29 had seen the handwriting on the wall -- offered some  
30 other inducement just at the psychological moment of





1 teacher advertising and placement of teachers for  
2 their staff.

3 May I continue, sir?

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

5 MR. YOUNG: There is no question that  
6 a uniform salary schedule is necessary to eliminate  
7 the heartache we undergo each year, and even the one  
8 Board which has chiefly deviated from the norm (I  
9 will not name this Board again) has seen the  
10 error of its ways to some extent, and for the current  
11 year has established a basic schedule in substantial  
12 agreement with other boards. The value of the  
13 work of the Metropolitan unofficial Salary Committee  
14 has been felt in all local boards' schedules, and the  
15 basic work it did in establishing and regularizing  
16 category qualifications has been extremely beneficial.  
17 These category levels have become the recognized  
18 basis of all Metropolitan schedules and are reflected  
19 in the teacher organizations' schedules as well as  
20 the schedules of other Boards across the province.

21 I would like to say again that I do not  
22 consider a uniform salary schedule to be the complete  
23 answer to the present teacher problems, neither do  
24 I consider that unrestricted competition amongst the  
25 limited pool of teachers, experienced teachers that  
26 we have available for our area is an answer. There  
27 are areas in which the Metropolitan School Board and  
28 the provincial government can work in the future --  
29 should work in the future -- by which we can solve  
30 this problem and attract our brainy young people into







1 the profession.

2 It is noted on page 27 of our brief that  
3 there really is a double standard in school construc-  
4 tion prevailing, and we believe that costs could  
5 be levelled out over the entire area if the Metro-  
6 politan School Board had authority to restrict in-  
7 discriminate standards in school construction. We  
8 submit for consideration that the Metropolitan  
9 School Board be given this authority in association  
10 with its existing authority respecting approvals  
11 for the issuance of debentures.

12 We also make reference to the matter of  
13 research, and feel that metropolitan research  
14 facilities, if available to the whole area, could  
15 improve the educational services for all local boards.

16 As we stated in our opening comments the  
17 foremost point in support of a borough system having a  
18 considerable measure of local autonomy is that the  
19 existing metropolitan area is far too large to form  
20 a single unit. The great fear of the elected repre-  
21 sentatives of this Board is that a highly organized  
22 central authority, either for education or for general  
23 purposes, would be unwieldy, autocratic and devoid of  
24 any real contact with local problems.

25 The present needs would indicate a fur-  
26 ther evolution of the federated municipalities, but  
27 not so far as the irretrievable step of complete  
28 amalgamation.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you not contra-  
30 dicting yourself when you talk of the desirability





1 of a considerable measure of local autonomy on the  
2 one hand, as you have just done, and on the other  
3 hand you would take away from the local school boards  
4 the right to negotiate and fix teachers' salaries  
5 and secondly the right to determine what their school  
6 construction standards should be?

7 MR. YOUNG: No, not at all. If you  
8 will allow me to explain that, sir, No. 1, the  
9 Metropolitan School Board is comprised of repre-  
10 sentatives of all the area boards and the Metro-  
11 politan School Board itself is a composition of  
12 all of the trustees of the Metropolitan area through  
13 their representatives on the Metropolitan Board. In  
14 effect these people reflect the feelings of their  
15 boards besides their own individual feelings and  
16 as a complete group in establishing salaries within  
17 the Metropolitan area they are doing it on behalf  
18 of their own boards and on behalf of the Metropolitan  
19 area. It is not a responsibility which has been  
20 taken by an outside body in any way.

21 That is No. 1. It is also within the  
22 minimum area of the Board's autonomy in regard to  
23 individual construction. It has never been sug-  
24 gested that the local areas would give the authority  
25 for the design of a school, the particular structures,  
26 over to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan School  
27 Board. This would pertain in their local area,  
28 but there would be overall building and not standards  
29 or sizes. These things are actually in existence  
30 today and they do not in any way take away from the





1 autonomy of the local board. I know that I spend  
2 sometimes four and five nights a week and afternoons  
3 on committees working out at the moment designs of  
4 schools and features we want in our own area, and  
5 yet we are still within the jurisdiction of the  
6 Metropolitan School Board who set the standards with  
7 regard to size and general construction costs.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: But you are going  
9 further now, are you not? As I understand it today  
10 the Metropolitan School Board has in a sense a  
11 ceiling cost, it has a ceiling cost formula?

12 MR. YOUNG: Yes.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: And it will assume the  
14 debt up to that ceiling cost. If an individual board  
15 wants to go beyond that, it may do so provided it  
16 pays for it through the current levy; is that not  
17 right?

18 MR. YOUNG: Yes, that is right.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You would prohibit the  
20 latter, would you not?

21 MR. YOUNG: I would say there are many  
22 suggestions here of the way . . . The word "prohibit"  
23 is too strong. This here is a suggestion. This is  
24 not a recommendation. These are details that will  
25 have to be worked out. My feeling personally is  
26 that the ceiling is in order and that there can be  
27 a leeway of a limited amount -- a limited amount,  
28 not an unlimited amount which a local board could  
29 spend on its own in order to bring the standards up  
30 to unnecessary heights. I do not say that these







standards that you would put in of local costs should be entirely restricted, but I would say that there should be a ceiling to it.

THE COMMISSIONER: I am not arguing with you.

MR. YOUNG: I understand that. I am just clarifying that.

THE COMMISSIONER: I just want to clarify in my own mind what will be left to the individual school boards if your suggestions are accepted and the power of the Metropolitan Board is increased along the lines that you have set out. That is why I have asked these questions.

MR. YOUNG: I would say, sir, that from my own personal experience and the trustees, the work that goes on in the Board, there are not enough hours in the day still to carry through successfully and thoroughly the amount of work that would still be relegated to the local trustees under the plan that we recommend. We are always short of hours. We always will be.

THE COMMISSIONER: I can well understand that.

MR. YOUNG: It is very obvious that many geographic boundaries could be selected to outline various borough systems. We provide two alternatives in our submission, not with any great desire to expand ourselves but to demonstrate what we feel might prove to be practicable divisions. They are submitted as illustrations of what the York Board has





1 had in mind for several years, and they are very  
2 similar to the suggestions made to the Metropolitan  
3 School Board in 1962 as you will have already noted  
4 from the appendix to our brief.

5 Highway 401 is a logical and natural  
6 boundary limit to the north. St. Clair Avenue, Yonge  
7 Street and the Humber River are other well defined  
8 limits which lend themselves to borough outlines.

9  
10 -

11  
12  
13  
14 -

15  
16  
17 -

18  
19  
20  
21 -

22  
23  
24  
25 -

26  
27  
28  
29  
30







1                   Keeping in mind the London Government  
2 proposals that the borough size should be approximately  
3 200,000 persons wherever possible, the suggested  
4 boroughs included on pages 38 and 39, apart from  
5 the suggested Toronto borough, contain or have the  
6 future potential of approximately one-quarter million  
7 or better persons.

8                   The first proposal enlarges the proposed  
9 boroughs of York and East York to Highway 401 to  
10 establish a satisfactory population area and to  
11 provide for future expansion.

12                   Similarly, it is suggested the North York  
13 northerly boundary be extended to the new proposed  
14 Highway 407 so as to incorporate into it, the  
15 expansion taking place in the southerly sections  
16 of Vaughan and Markham Townships and also to provide  
17 for future expansion. The suggested Borough of  
18 Etobicoke includes the Lakeshore municipalities,  
19 while the Borough of Scarborough includes the whole  
20 of that existing municipality.

21                   Decreasing the number of municipalities and  
22 establishing boroughs approximately the same size,  
23 would relieve the most flagrant of the difficulties  
24 respecting representation which now exist, and  
25 where one municipality having a population of 9,000  
26 odd has equal representation as municipalities such  
27 as Scarborough of about 230,000.

28                   In maintaining the existing City of Toronto  
29 as a complete borough, it is felt that due regard  
30 is given to the proposed Borough of Toronto and its





1 contribution to the financial support of the  
2 Metropolitan area as a whole through its high com-  
3 mercial ratio of assessment.

4 There is an alternate borough boundary  
5 proposal noted on page 46, which we believe also has  
6 merit, and the advantage of straightening boundaries to  
7 well defined streets and roads, as well as having the  
8 potential expansion possibilities noted in connection  
9 with the first alternative.

10 At present there exists in each major  
11 municipality including York, an able school admini-  
12 stration which could easily assimilate additional limited  
13 areas without difficulty, headed with a minimum person-  
14 nel which operates efficiently and with the maximum of  
15 economy and which has intimate knowledge of its staff  
16 and local problems. Amalgamation will not eliminate  
17 the need for this personnel nor result in lower costs.  
18 The upheaval caused by the replacement of these effici-  
19 ent self-sustaining units could be disastrous. The of-  
20 ficials of the various areas when serving on Metropolitan  
21 Committees, approach their duties with autonomy and  
22 with freedom to express independent thinking. This as-  
23 pect would be eliminated if all were under one leader and  
24 owed allegiance to the same head.

25 It is obvious that if area boards were  
26 amalgamated and if the existing standards of the Toronto  
27 Board were applied over the Metropolitan Area, then  
28 total education costs would rise extraordinarily in most  
29 other areas. It does not necessarily follow that the  
30





1 best education is the costliest. No one can cate-  
2 gorically state that at the present time the education  
3 provided in one municipality is better than that pro-  
4 vided in another. But in an amalgamated area all areas  
5 would have to be treated alike and since a decline in  
6 service would be clearly unacceptable then all stand-  
7 ards would rise to the level of the best. But if the  
8 costliest standard, wherever it exists, is the stand-  
9 ard to be applied then we must seriously face the  
10 question of whether this would not be an unfair burden  
11 on the taxpayer.

12                 There seems to be an outward appearance  
13 of disunity at the Metropolitan level, but this is not  
14 unusual in our democratic system of government and  
15 frank discussion is found at all levels. From my own  
16 personal experience of some years at the Metropolitan  
17 School Board, the degree of lack of harmony is a  
18 fraction of that expressed in other areas of government.

19                 The fundamental basis of representation  
20 should be one of representation by population. Some  
21 difficulties have been experienced because of the present  
22 constitution of metropolitan school board membership.  
23 Some method of representation needs to be devised to  
24 relieve the pressure of block votes. The proposed  
25 boroughs outlined in our brief may assist in this area.  
26 Since each proposed borough would be large enough to  
27 operate a fully integrated and complete system of  
28 education, with all factors at a Metropolitan School  
29 Board level likely to influence each Borough equally,  
30







1 a real consensus would more likely appear in any voting  
2 procedure. In the existing system not all items dis-  
3 cussed at the Metropolitan School Board level affect  
4 each municipality to the same degree, if in some cases  
5 at all, and this has had a bearing we believe in the  
6 exercising of block votes. We believe that the pos-  
7 sibility exists and may have occurred, where a munici-  
8 pality not entirely conversant with a subject under re-  
9 view because it does not relate directly to its smaller  
10 organization, is tempted to vote with the majority.  
11 When all municipalities are directly concerned with all  
12 matters, convictions from experience will be stated in  
13 discussion and the real consensus emerge.

14 Mr. Commissioner, the Board of Education  
15 for the Township of York recommends that the existing  
16 Metropolitan School Board be continued as a second tier  
17 of government in a similar way as at present, apart  
18 from representation, but with extended powers.

19 Presupposing a Metropolitan School Board  
20 with extended powers in areas of:

- 21 a) Teachers' salaries,
- 22 b) Capital costs for school con-  
23 struction and sites,
- 24 c) Research,
- 25 d) Maintenance assistance payments,
- 26 e) Special education,
- 27 f) Debenture debt --

28 if these were under the control of the Metropolitan  
29 School Board educational costs would, of necessity, level  
30 out and more equal standards prevail.





1 We believe this can be  
2 done all within the concept of the borough system re-  
3 cognizing at the same time, that some price in local  
4 autonomy must be paid. We believe, however, that the  
5 extension of the Metropolitan School Board's direct  
6 control can be effected in areas which will leave local  
7 boroughs still in close contact with their communities  
8 and at the same time directly responsible to them, but  
9 working in major areas on a common Metropolitan basis.

10 All of which are proposals, and they  
11 are offered not as a panacea for whatever ills our  
12 metropolitan system may suffer from, but they are sug-  
13 gestions to outline to you our modest appraisal and  
14 view, that the existing Metropolitan School Board has  
15 been to a very large degree a successful operation, and  
16 we believe it ought to continue to play an important  
17 part in overall metropolitan problems within a revised  
18 federated borough plan.

19 The Board's position throughout any  
20 discussions involving amalgamation suggestions or some  
21 other suitable form of re-shaping of the metropolitan  
22 organization, has steadily been one for thorough and  
23 unbiased review, and the Board has been greatly en-  
24 couraged that the Ontario Government saw fit to es-  
25 tablish the present Royal Commission to undertake just  
26 such a study.

27 Finally, we would stress that already we  
28 are a comprehensive unit, under the name of  
29 Metropolitan Toronto. This was clearly established in  
30







1 1953 by Bill 80 and the ties have been firmly secured.  
2 We have growing pains but these will continue as long  
3 as the Metropolitan area continues to expand. The  
4 problem is not really whether we will be one or whether  
5 we will be divided, but rather it is a matter of what  
6 best method of operation should be evolved for our  
7 ultimate good.

8 We wish you, sir, good fortune in your  
9 deliberations and we look forward with anticipation to  
10 your conclusions.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: On the borough system  
12 which you recommend, I note that York Township would  
13 absorb the Town of Weston, the Village of Forest Hill and  
14 a very substantial and important portion of North York  
15 lying south of Highway 401 and west of Yonge Street.  
16 Now, at the outset of your brief you spoke of the deira-  
17 bility of maintaining local interest, connection between  
18 the local trustee and the local people. How will that  
19 local connection be affected insofar as Forest Hill or  
20 Weston or the part of North York that you want are  
21 concerned?

22 MR. YOUNG: I would be very glad to  
23 elaborate on that. Firstly, with regard to Weston,  
24 Weston is a community, an older community of Toronto,  
25 with whom we have already had a certain amount of  
26 identification. We believe that geographically their  
27 area would fit in very readily with ours and that ours  
28 is a large enough administration to absorb them, their  
29 personnel, without any fuss or any physical hardship or  
30





1 human hardship.

2 We believe with regard to Forest Hill  
3 Village that there is also a close geographical re-  
4 lationship, and that they could be merged with York  
5 Township; that we will gain from their knowledge, from  
6 their experience, and that they will gain from ours;  
7 that none of their achievements education-wise, com-  
8 munity-wise, will be lost within the bounds of whatever  
9 the ultimate municipality is named, nor will the system  
10 of education -- it could well and easily be incorpor-  
11 ated within the over-all framework just as it is with-  
12 in Metropolitan Toronto.

13 I think that York and Forest Hill would  
14 gain to a large degree. We would get fresh blood and  
15 fresh ideas. So would they.

16 With regard to North York, the geo-  
17 graphical boundary of 401 was picked specifically to  
18 stabilize possibly for the next ten years boundaries  
19 within the Metropolitan area of Toronto because the  
20 most extreme burst in population is taking place in  
21 that area, and North York to a greater degree than any  
22 other area will fill up population-wise and cause the  
23 balancing of the figure of somewhere round about one-  
24 quarter of a million.

25 These are just suggestions which you in  
26 your wisdom, if you see the justice of our brief and  
27 similar briefs, will have to work out. I am sure you  
28 will draw your own conclusions, but we think they are  
29 legitimate suggestions. North York, specifically from  
30





1 the point of view of growth because it would be a pity  
2 in the next five years, or six years, if their growth  
3 would be to a degree where it would again cause an-  
4 other re-location of boundaries. We have that major  
5 area which would cause concern in seven, eight or nine  
6 years or even ten years time in keeping a balanced bo-  
7 rough population.

8 One further thing: it is not put with  
9 the idea that we want to gain any specific population  
10 advantage or assessment advantage because, as we have  
11 stated in our brief, we specifically believe that as-  
12 sessment through industry is really a cause and should  
13 be a benefit to the whole of the metropolitan area, and  
14 we would not feel that we should benefit unduly or in  
15 any way through that additional assessment.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: If you got that part  
17 of North York you certainly would benefit through that  
18 additional assessment.

19 MR. YOUNG: We would benefit in the im-  
20 mediate, but there is no question that a formula can  
21 be adopted. If that were the most desirable boundary,  
22 and population-wise if it was just a question of the  
23 assessment in that one area which was the obstacle to  
24 setting up that boundary, a formula can be arrived at  
25 I am sure to solve that particular area problem. But  
26 it is definitely not put in to give us any advantage  
27 in dollars and cents. It is just from a geographic  
28 standpoint and also from a population balance for the  
29 future. That is our only interest.  
30







1 THE COMMISSIONER: Those are all the  
2 questions I have to ask. Thank you very much.

3 MR. YOUNG: I appreciate it.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Does any member of  
5 your delegation want to add anything?

6 MR. OKE: Mr. Commissioner, I would like  
7 to point out to the Commission through you, Mr. Chairman,  
8 that all that area other than the Town of Weston was  
9 at one time part of York Township.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I know that. It has  
11 also been suggested to me that the Township of York  
12 might be annexed to the City of Toronto.

13 MR. YOUNG: We don't know what will  
14 happen. We might end up in weird and wonderful ways.  
15 I doubt it very much. We have sufficient confidence in  
16 you, sir, that you will evaluate all the briefs, and  
17 we will accept your recommendations whatever they be,  
18 and we will do our best for the public welfare in  
19 Metropolitan Toronto or the City of Toronto, whichever  
20 it might be.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: With those words I  
22 can't ask any more questions. Thank you. I now ad-  
23 journ to ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

24  
25 ---WHEREUPON THE HEARING ADJOURNED UNTIL TEN O'CLOCK  
26 WEDNESDAY, MAY 6TH, 1964  
27  
28  
29  
30

















